

**DELHI  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY.**

*Class No. 909*

*Book No. H12U*  
*V.3*

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No. VI:5=N2

F9.3

As. No. 16,153

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of one anna will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime





Universal  
HISTORY  
OF THE WORLD

---

*VOLUME THREE*



# UNIVERSAL HISTORY OF THE WORLD

Written by One Hundred and Fifty of  
our Foremost Living Authorities in  
all Branches of Historical Knowledge

Edited by  
J. A. Hammerton.

VOLUME THREE  
pages 1401-2028

From the Hellenistic Age to  
the Empire under Hadrian



LONDON  
THE EDUCATIONAL BOOK CO. LTD  
Tallis House Whitefriars



# VOLUME THREE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chronicle VI. THE HELLENISTIC AGE : 360-280 B.C.		PAGE
The rise of Macedon .. .. .		1401
Campaigns of Philip of Macedon .. .. .		1403
Philip's death and Alexander's succession .. .. .		1406
The Persian War .. .. .		1407
Conquest of India .. .. .		1408
The Succession States .. .. .		1410
The Maurya Dynasty in India .. .. .		1415
Events in Sicily .. .. .		1415
Rome's struggles in Italy .. .. .		1417
Synchronised Table of Dates .. .. .		1421

### CHAPTER 46

#### ALEXANDER AS WORLD HERO : A STUDY

By W. Romaine Paterson

Alexander's generalship .. .. .	1423
His character .. .. .	1425
Organization of his army .. .. .	1429
Battle of the Granicus .. .. .	1431
Battle of Issus and its results .. .. .	1435
Battle of Gaugamela .. .. .	1440
Advance into India .. .. .	1444
Death of Alexander .. .. .	1446

### CHAPTER 47

#### THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS : THEIR TRIUMPHS AND FAILURES

By Edwyn Bevan, D.Litt., LL.D.

Lecturer on Hellenistic History and Literature, King's College, London

Beginnings of Philosophy .. .. .	1451
Pythagoras and his successors .. .. .	1453
Socrates—creator of a new epoch .. .. .	1454
The Cynics .. .. .	1457
The position of Plato .. .. .	1458
Aristotle's views .. .. .	1461
The Epicureans .. .. .	1466

### CHAPTER 48

#### THE GREEKS AND SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY

By Charles Singer, M.D., D.Litt.

Lecturer in the History of Medicine in the University of London

The Greeks and Nature .. .. .	1467
Greek Geometry .. .. .	1468
The Ionian School .. .. .	1470
The schools of Magna Graecia .. .. .	1472
Hippocrates and early medicine .. .. .	1475
Plato and Mathematics .. .. .	1480
Aristotle's Biology and Physics .. .. .	1482

### CHAPTER 49

#### THE EASTWARD SPREAD OF HELLENISM

By H. G. Rawlinson

Principal and Professor of English, Deccan College, Poona

Effect of Alexander's conquests .. .. .	1488
Greek principalities on the Indian frontier .. .. .	1491
Trade between India and the West .. .. .	1492
Hellenism in Bactria and India .. .. .	1495
Buddhist India and China .. .. .	1501
Oriental influence on Greece and Rome .. .. .	1505

## CHAPTER 50 THE CELTIC PEOPLES : THEIR CULTURE AND THEIR TRAGEDY

By R. A. S. Macalister, Litt.D., LL.D.

Professor of Celtic Archaeology, University College, Dublin

	PAGE
Definition of word 'Celtic' .. .. .	1507
Poseidonius on the Gauls .. .. .	1511
Celtic archaeology and La Tène culture .. .. .	1515
Story of King Ambigatus .. .. .	1523
Alexander and the Celts .. .. .	1524
Cæsar in Gaul .. .. .	1528

## CHAPTER 51 ANCIENT COMMERCE AND THE MEDITERRANEAN

By G. H. Stevenson

Fellow and Prælector in Ancient History, University College, Oxford

The Geography of Herodotus .. .. .	1531
Early attempts at colonisation .. .. .	1536
Trade in the Mediterranean .. .. .	1540
Piracy and its suppression .. .. .	1546
Greek currency and the origins of banking .. .. .	1549

## CHAPTER 52 WHAT THE MODERN WORLD OWES TO GREECE

By the Rt. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, LL.D., F.R.S.

Warden of New College, Oxford

Scope of Hellenic Civilization .. .. .	1555
Persistence of Greek Architecture, Art and Literature .. .. .	1558
Christianity's debt to the Greeks .. .. .	1564
Medicine and Science .. .. .	1566
Education .. .. .	1568

## Chronicle VII. THE BEGINNINGS OF ROMAN POWER : 280-201 B.C.

Synchronised Table of Dates .. .. .	1570
Pyrrhus against Rome .. .. .	1572
The First Punic War .. .. .	1578
The Second Punic War .. .. .	1583
Events in India and the East .. .. .	1586
The Battle of Zama .. .. .	1591

## CHAPTER 53 ROME AND THE REASONS FOR HER LATER GREATNESS

By H. Stuart-Jones, D.Litt.

Principal of University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

Sources for Rome's early history .. .. .	1593
Roman government .. .. .	1596
Internal struggles in Italy .. .. .	1601
Roman supremacy established .. .. .	1608
Italic tribal organizations .. .. .	1611

## CHAPTER 54 THE CARTHAGINIANS AND THEIR MARITIME EMPIRE

By F. N. Pryce

Asst. Keeper of Dept. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum

Paucity of information about Carthage .. .. .	1613
Life in the ancient city .. .. .	1618
Religion and burial customs .. .. .	1622
The Carthaginian Empire .. .. .	1631
Government and social organization .. .. .	1634
The Army and Navy .. .. .	1636
Commerce .. .. .	1641

## CHAPTER 55 PATRICIANS AND PLEBS : ROME'S WARRING FACTIONS

By H. Stuart-Jones

Origin of the Patricians and Plebeians .. .. .	1643
Causes of class distinctions .. .. .	1647
The Laws of the Twelve Tables .. .. .	1648
Steps in plebeian emancipation .. .. .	1651
The end of the struggle .. .. .	1653

## CHAPTER 56 HANNIBAL : HISTORY'S MOST GLORIOUS FAILURE

By Captain B. H. Liddell Hart		PAGE
Hannibal's oath of enmity to Rome .. .. .		1655
The Alps crossed .. .. .		1656
The campaigns in Italy .. .. .		1659
Death of Hannibal .. .. .		1666

## CHAPTER 57 THE AGONY OF GREECE : HOW THE LEAGUES AROSE

By Edwyn Bevan		
Organization of the Aetolian League .. .. .		1668
Rise of the Achaean League .. .. .		1671
Shifting alliances .. .. .		1674
Rome enters the stage .. .. .		1677

## THIRD ERA

### *The World State : 201 B.C.—A.D. 476*

#### Chronicle VIII. THE NEW AGE OF ROMAN CONQUEST : 201-133 B.C.

Table of Dates .. .. .	1684
Roman interference in Greece .. .. .	1687
Rome in Asia, Gaul and Spain .. .. .	1689
Destruction of Carthage .. .. .	1698
The Maccabees in Palestine .. .. .	1702

## CHAPTER 58 THE SPIRIT OF REPUBLICAN ROME

By Joseph Wells		
Warden of Wadham College, Oxford		
Cicero on the State .. .. .		1705
Misgovernment of the Provinces .. .. .		1708
Roman rule in Italy .. .. .		1711
Signs of degeneration .. .. .		1714

## CHAPTER 59 THE WAR-CRAFT OF THE ROMANS

By T. Rice Holmes, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.		
Military organization .. .. .		1717
Battle array and equipment .. .. .		1722
Conduct of a battle .. .. .		1727
Artillery .. .. .		1728
Methods of assault .. .. .		1731
Naval power .. .. .		1732

## CHAPTER 60 THE RELIGION OF THE LATINS

By Cyril Bailey		
Jowett Fellow and Classical Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford		
Animism in early Latium .. .. .		1735
Religion of the Family .. .. .		1736
Agricultural Religion .. .. .		1745
State Religion .. .. .		1745
Adoption of Greek ritual .. .. .		1753

## CHAPTER 61 HOW GREEK CULTURE CAME TO ROME

By R. S. Conway, Litt.D.		
Hulme Professor of Latin, Victoria University of Manchester		
Result of peaceful penetration .. .. .		1756
Rome's adoption of Greek deities .. .. .		1758
Politics and Science .. .. .		1761
Introduction of Stoicism .. .. .		1763

#### Chronicle IX. ROME'S EXPANSION : 133-31 B.C.

Table of Dates .. .. .	1764
Organization of the Provinces .. .. .	1765
Legislation of the Gracchi .. .. .	1766
The Jugurthine War.. .. .	1769



## ROME'S EXPANSION—Continued

	PAGE
The Social War .. .. .	1772
Third or Great Mithradatic War .. .. .	1775
Julius Caesar's rise to power .. .. .	1781
Mark Antony and Octavian .. .. .	1789

### CHAPTER 62

#### THE FABRIC OF THE ROMAN STATE

By H. Stuart-Jones

The Popular Assemblies : Comitia Curiata .. .. .	1795
The Comitia Centuriata .. .. .	1796
The Senate .. .. .	1797
Dictatorship and the Comitia Tributa .. .. .	1799
The Censors and their duties .. .. .	1800
Government of the Provinces .. .. .	1803

### CHAPTER 63

#### SOCIAL LIFE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

By F. H. Marshall

Koraeus Professor of Byzantine History, King's College, London

A typical Roman farm .. .. .	1812
Social conditions in the Ciceronian age .. .. .	1816
Growth of Epicureanism .. .. .	1819
Life of the Plebeians .. .. .	1822
Slavery .. .. .	1825
The Roman Matron .. .. .	1827
Amusements and Festivals .. .. .	1828

### CHAPTER 64

#### FROM THE GRACCHI TO AUGUSTUS

By F. A. Wright

Professor of Classics in the University of London

The two Gracchi .. .. .	1831
Gaius Marius .. .. .	1832
L. Cornelius Sulla .. .. .	1833
M. Licinius Crassus .. .. .	1834
Pompey the Great .. .. .	1835
M. Porcius Cato .. .. .	1836
Career of Julius Caesar .. .. .	1837
Cicero the orator .. .. .	1838
Mark Antony and Agrippa .. .. .	1839
Octavianus Augustus .. .. .	1841

#### Chronicle X. THE SHAPING OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE : 31 B.C.—A.D. 98

Table of Dates .. .. .	1842
Augustus as Emperor .. .. .	1843
Reign of Tiberius .. .. .	1849
Atrocities of Caligula .. .. .	1853
Claudius and the conquest of Britain .. .. .	1854
Nero, the last of the Julian Emperors .. .. .	1855
Galba, Otho and Vitellius .. .. .	1857
Vespasian and the Flavian Emperors .. .. .	1859

### CHAPTER 65

#### THE NEW IMPERIAL IDEA

By Joseph Wells

Genius of Augustus .. .. .	1864
Civil functions of the Emperor .. .. .	1867
Danube and German campaigns .. .. .	1871
Decay of the Augustan system .. .. .	1873
Augustus worship .. .. .	1877

### CHAPTER 66

#### THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND ITS LITERATURE

By J. Wight Duff, D.Litt., LL.D.

Professor of Classics, Armstrong College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Characteristics of the language .. .. .	1879
Earliest literature .. .. .	1884
The Golden Age .. .. .	1888
The Silver Age .. .. .	1893

## CHAPTER 67 PAGANISM AND THE PHILOSOPHIES

By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D.  
Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, London

Persistence of the ancient ceremonies .. .. .	1900
Philosophy substituted for Religion .. .. .	1903
Stoicism .. .. .	1904
Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius .. .. .	1907
Zeno and Epicurus .. .. .	1909

## CHAPTER 68 THE FLOURISHING OF ART AND LITERATURE

By H. B. Walters, F.S.A.

Deputy Keeper of Dept. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum

Etruscan art .. .. .	1911
Characteristics of Roman Architecture .. .. .	1915
Sculpture and Portraiture .. .. .	1919
Narrative art .. .. .	1927
Roman Painting and Mosaics .. .. .	1933
Metal work and pottery .. .. .	1939

## CHAPTER 69 THE FALL OF JERUSALEM AND ITS WORLD SIGNIFICANCE

By W. A. L. Ehnslie, D.D.

Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature in Westminster College

The Babylonian exile .. .. .	1943
Jerusalem rebuilt by Nehemiah .. .. .	1949
Quarrel with the Samaritans .. .. .	1950
Judaism and Hellenism .. .. .	1953
Survival of Judaism .. .. .	1961

## CHRONICLE XL THE EMPIRE IN ITS GRANDEUR : A.D. 98-211

Table of Dates .. .. .	1962
Reign of Trajan .. .. .	1963
The Dacian expedition .. .. .	1965
Hadrian and Antoninus Pius .. .. .	1969
Marcus Aurelius and his successors .. .. .	1972

## CHAPTER 70 A ROMAN CITIZEN SURVEYS THE WORLD

By Hugh Last

Lecturer in Classical and Ancient History, St. John's College, Oxford

Establishment of the frontier .. .. .	1983
Roman Geography .. .. .	1987
Trade with China .. .. .	1989
Agriculture and imported corn .. .. .	1994
Religious toleration .. .. .	1998

## CHAPTER 71 A DAY IN THE LIFE OF IMPERIAL ROME

By F. H. Marshall

Social divisions .. .. .	2001
Character of Women .. .. .	2005
Streets and Houses .. .. .	2007
Dress and the day's work .. .. .	2011
Amusements .. .. .	2021

# LIST OF SPECIAL PLATES

### PLATES IN FULL COLOURS

Lion Hunt of Alexander on the Sidon Sarcophagus (3-page folder) ..	Facing p. 1434
Enamel Work, Weapons and Jewelry of the British Celts (2 pages) ..	" " 1520
Map of the Roman Empire in the Days of Trajan (2-page folder) ..	" " 1962
Reconstruction of the Baths of Caracalla at Rome .. .. .	" " 2020
Roman Mosaics from Pompeii and Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli .. .. .	" " 2021

### PLATES IN SEPIA

Reconstruction of Carthage at the Height of her Power (3-page folder) ..	Facing p. 1614
Masterpieces of Roman Sculpture and Portraiture .. .. .	pp. 1921-23
Roman Craftsmanship in Precious Metals .. .. .	p. 1924

# SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

## CHRONICLES VI to XI

- BEVAN, EDWYN, *The House of Seleucus*, 1902  
 BURY, J. B., *History of Greece*, 1922  
 CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, Vols. VI and VII, 1927-8  
 CURTIUS, E., *History of Greece*, 1886  
 GROTE, GEORGE, *History of Greece*, 1869-70  
 HEITLAND, W. E., *The Roman Republic*, 3 vols., 2nd ed., 1923  
 LIVY, trs. B. O. Foster (Loeb Edition), 1919  
 MAHAFFY, J. P., *The Empires of the Ptolemies*, 1895  
 MERIVALE, CHARLES, *History of the Romans under the Empire*, Vols. II and III, 1865  
 MOMMSEN, J., *History of Rome*, trs. W. P. Dickson, Vols. II and III, 1868-86  
 OMAR, C. W. C., *History of Greece*, 7th ed., 1901  
 PELHAM, H. F., *Outlines of Roman History*, 1909  
 POLYBIUS, *Historics*, trs. E. S. Schuchburgh, Book VI, 1889  
 ROSTOVITZ, M. I., *A History of the Ancient World*, Vol. I, *The Orient and Greece*, 1926  
 Vol. II, *Rome*, 1927  
 SUTONIUS TRANQUILLUS, C., *History of Twelve Caesars*, trs. P. Holland, 1606, ed. J. H. Froese, 1923  
 TACITUS, PUBLIUS CORNELIUS, *Annals*, ed. H. Furneaux, 2 vols., 2nd ed., 1896-1907  
 WELLS, JOSEPH, *Short History of Rome to the Death of Augustus*, 17th ed., 1919

## CHAPTER XLVI

### ALEXANDER AS WORLD HERO

- ARRIAN, FLAVIUS, *Expéditions d'Alexandre*, trs. Chaussard, 1849-51  
 BAUMBACH, A., *Kleinasien unter Alexander den Grossen*, 1911  
 CURTIUS RUFUS, Q., *History of Alexander the Great*, trs. J. Lightfoot, 1904  
 HOGARTH, D. G., *Philip and Alexander, of Macedon*, 1897  
 MACCRINDLE, J. W., *The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great*, 2nd ed., 1896  
 MAHAFFY, J. P., *Alexander's Empire*, 1902  
 PLUTARCH, *Life of Alexander the Great*, trs. J. and W. Langhorne, 1886  
 WHEELER, B. I., *Alexander the Great*, 1900

## CHAPTER XLVII

### THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS

- ARISTOTLE, *Translations of works issued by Oxford University Press*  
 BEVAN, EDWYN, *Stoics and Sceptics*, 1913  
 BURNET, JOHN, *Early Greek Philosophy*, 1920  
*Greek Philosophy: from Thales to Plato*, 1914  
 GOMPERZ, THEODOR, *Greek Thinkers*, 4 vols., trs. J. Magnus and G. G. Berry, 1901-12  
 HICKS, R. D., *Stoic and Epicurean*, 1910  
 PLATO, *Dialogues*, trs. B. Jowett, 1903  
*Translations of works in Macmillan's Golden Treasury Series*  
 ROSS, W. D., *Aristotle*, 1923  
 TAYLOR, ALFRED EDWARD, *Aristotle*, 1912  
 Plato, 1922  
 Plato, *The Man and His Work*, 1926  
 Platonism and Its Influence, 1925  
 ZELLER, EDUARD, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, trs. S. F. Alleyne, 2 vols., 1881  
 Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, trs. Costelloe and Muirhead, 2 vols., 1897

- Plato and the Older Academy, trs. S. F. Alleyne and A. Goodwin, 1888  
 Socrates and The Socratic Schools, trs. O. J. Reichel, 1885 [Reichel, 1892  
 Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics, trs. O. J.

## CHAPTER XLVIII

### THE GREEKS AND SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY

- ARISTOTLE, *De Anima*, trs. R. D. Hicks, 1907  
*De Generatione Animalium*, trs. J. A. Platt, 1912  
*De Partibus Animalium*, trs. W. Ogle, 1912  
*Historia Animalium*, trs. D. W. Thompson, 1908  
 BAILEY, CYRIL, and others, *Legacy of Rome*, 1924  
 HEATH, T. L., *History of Greek Mathematics*, 2 vols., 1921 [Greece, 1921  
 LIVINGSTONE, R. W., and others, *Legacy of Science*, C., *Short History of Medicine*, 1928  
 THEOPHRASTUS, *Historia Plantarum*, trs. Sir A. Hort, 2 vols., 1916

## CHAPTER XLIX

### EASTWARD SPREAD OF HELLENISM

- CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF INDIA, Vol. 1, 1922  
 FOUCHER, A., *L'art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhara*, 1905  
 MACCRINDLE, J. W., *Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian*, 1877  
 Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, 1901  
 MAHAFFY, J. P., *The Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire*, 1905  
 OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA, 1919  
 RAWLINSON, H. G., *Bactria*, 1912  
 Intercourse between India and the Western World, 1925 [1912  
 SCHOFF, W. H., *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, 1907  
 STEIN, SIR MARC AUREL, *Ancient Khotan*, 1907  
 Ruins of Desert Cathay, 2 vols., 1912  
 Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan, 1903

## CHAPTER L

### THE CELTIC PEOPLES

- ALLEN, J. R., *Celtic Art in Pagan and Christian Times*, 2nd ed., 1912  
 BERTRAND, A., and REINACH, S., *Les Celtes dans les vallées du Po et du Danube*, 1894  
 DECHELETTE, J., *Manuel d'archéologie pré-historique celtique et gallo-romaine*, 1908-14  
 DOTTIN, G., *Manuel pour servir à l'étude de l'antiquité celtique*, 1915  
 HOLMES, T. RICE, *Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar*, 1907  
 Caesar's Conquest of Gaul, 1911  
 KENDRICK, T. D., *The Druids*, 1927  
 MACALISTER, R. A. S., *The Archaeology of Ireland*, 1928 [Celts, 1911  
 MACCULLOCH, J. A., *The Religion of the Ancient*

## CHAPTER LI

### ANCIENT COMMERCE

- GARDNER, PERCY, *History of Ancient Coinage*, 1918  
 GLOTZ, GUSTAVE, *Ancient Greece at Work*, trs. M. R. Dobb, 1926 [1924  
 ORMEROD, H. A., *Piracy in the Ancient World*, 1888  
 RIDGEWAY, SIR WILLIAM, *The Origin of Currency*, 1888  
 TARN, W. W., *Hellenistic Civilization*, 1927  
 TOZER, H. F., *History of Ancient Geography*, 1897

## CHAPTER LII

### WHAT THE MODERN WORLD OWES TO GREECE

- BUTCHER, S. H., *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*, 3rd ed., 1904  
 LIVINGSTONE, R. W., *The Greek Genius and Its Meaning to Us*, 2nd ed., 1924  
*The Legacy of Greece*, 1921  
 WEBB, C. C. J., *History of Philosophy*, 1915  
 WHIBLEY, L., *A Companion to Greek Studies*, 2nd ed., 1906  
 ZIMMERN, A. E., *The Greek City States*, 4th ed., 1924  
*The Greek Commonwealth*, 4th ed., 1924

### CHAPTERS LIII, LVIII AND LXI REASONS FOR ROME'S LATER GREATNESS, SPIRIT OF REPUBLICAN ROME, AND GREEK CULTURE AT ROME

- BAILEY, CYRIL, *The Mind of Rome*, 1926  
 CONWAY, R. S., *New Studies of a Great Inheritance*, 1921  
*Italy in the Etruscan Age*, Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. IV, Chap. XIII  
 GRENIER, A. S., *The Roman Spirit in Religion, Thought and Art*, trs. M. R. Dobie, 1926  
 HOMO, L., *Primitive Italy and the Beginnings of Roman Imperialism*, trs. V. Gordon Childe, 1927  
 JOLIFFE, R. O., *Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration*, 1919  
 See also Bibliographies to other relevant chapters

## CHAPTER LIV

### THE GARTHAGINIANS AND THEIR MARITIME EMPIRE

- GSELL, S., *Histoire de l'Afrique*, 4 vols., 1912  
 MOORE, MABEL, *Carthage of the Phoenicians*, 1905  
 SMITH, R. BOSWORTH, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, 1897  
 WHITAKER, J. I. S., *Motya*, 1921

## CHAPTERS LV AND LXII

### PATRICIANS AND PLEBS, AND THE FABRIC OF THE ROMAN STATE

- ABBOT, F. F., *Roman Political Institutions*, 2nd ed., 1907  
 BOTSFORD, G. W., *Roman Assemblies*, 1909  
 GREENIDGE, A. H. J., *Roman Public Life*, 1901  
 HOMO, L., *Les institutions politiques romaines*, 1927  
 MOMMSEN, J., *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3rd ed., 1887  
 WILLEMS, P., *Le droit public romain*, 5th ed., 1883  
 See also Bibliography to Chronicles

## CHAPTER LVI

### A STUDY OF HANNIBAL

- COLIN, J. L. A., *Annibal en Gaule*, 1904  
 DELBRÜCK, HANS, *Geschichte d. Kriegskunst im Rahmen d. polit. Geschichte*, Vol. I, 1900  
 DODGE, T. A., *Great Captains: Hannibal*, 1889  
 HENNEBERT, EUGENE, *Histoire d'Annibal*, 1870-1902  
 KROMAYER, JOHANNES, *Antike Schlachtfelder*, 1903  
*Roms Kampf um die Welt Herrschaft*, 1912  
 LIDDELL HART, B. H., *A Greater than Napoleon: Scipio Africanus*, 1926

SMITH, R. BOSWORTH, *Rome and Carthage*, 1883  
 WILKINSON, SPENSER, *Hannibal's March through the Alps*, 1911

## CHAPTER LVII

### THE AGONY OF GREECE

- BOTSFORD, G. W. and SIHLER, E. G., *Hellenic Civilization*, 1915  
 FREEMAN, E. A., *History of Federal Government in Greece*, 2nd ed., 1893  
 PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, A. W., *Demosthenes and the last Days of Greek Freedom*, 1914  
 TARN, W. W., *Hellenistic Civilization*, 1927.

## CHAPTER LIX

### THE WAR-GRAFT OF THE ROMANS

- CAGNAT, R., *L'armée romaine d'Afrique*, 1912  
 CHEESMAN, G. L., *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, 1914  
 HOLMES, T. RICE, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, 2nd ed., 1911  
 LESQUIER, J., *L'armée romaine d'Egypte*, 1918  
 STUART-JONES, H., *Companion to Roman History*, 1912

## CHAPTER LX

### THE RELIGION OF THE LATINS

- BAILEY, CYRIL, *Religion of Ancient Rome*, 1907  
 FOWLER, W. WARDE, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 1911  
*The Roman Festivals*, 1899  
*Roman Ideas of Deity*, 1914  
 HALLIDAY, W. R., *Lectures on the History of Roman Religion*, 1922  
 ROSE, H. J., *Primitive Culture in Italy*, 1926

## CHAPTER LXIII

### SOCIAL LIFE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

- CHURCH, A. J., *Roman Life in the Days of Cicero*, 1884  
 FOWLER, W. WARDE, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, 1908  
 HEITLAND, W. E., *Agricola. A Study in Agriculture and Rustic Life in the Greco-Roman World*, 1921  
 MCDANIEL, W. B., *Roman Private Life and its Survivals (in Our Debt to Greece and Rome)*, 1925  
 PARK, M., *The Plebs in Cicero's Day*, 1918  
 SANDYS, J. E., *A Companion to Latin Studies*, 3rd ed., 1921

## CHAPTER LXIV

### FROM THE GRACCHI TO AUGUSTUS

- MYRTH, J. B., *Augustus Caesar*, 1903  
 FOWLER, W. W., *Julius Caesar*, 1894  
 OMAN, C. W. C., *Seven Roman Statesmen*, 1902  
 PETERSON, T., *Cicero, a Biography*, 1920  
 PLUTARCH, *Lives of Timoleon and the Gracchi*, ed. Charles Badham, 1881  
*Lives*, trs. Bernadotte Perrin, 2 vols., 1914-26  
 ROBINSON, F. W., *Marius, Sulla and Glaucia*, 1912  
 ROSTOVITZ, M. I., *Augustus*, 1922  
 STRACHAN-DAVIDSON, J. L., *Cicero*, 1894  
 See also Bibliography to Chronicles

## CHAPTER LXV

### THE NEW IMPERIAL IDEA

- ARNOLD, W. T., *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*, 3rd ed., 1914  
 BRYCE, JAMES, *Viscount, The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India; the Diffusion of Roman and English Law throughout the World*, 1914

# CHAPTER LXV—Continued

- CROMER, EVELYN BARING, *Lord, Ancient and Modern Imperialism*, 1910  
 HARDY, E. G., *The Monumentum Ancyranum*, 1923  
 FRANK, TENNEY, *Roman Imperialism*, 1914

## CHAPTER LXVI

### THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND ITS LITERATURE

- BUCK, CARL DARLING, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, 1904  
 BUTLER, H. E., *Post-Augustan Poetry*, 1909  
 CONWAY, R. S., *Italic Dialects*, 2 vols., 1897  
 The Making of Latin, 1923  
 D'ALTON, J. F., *Horace and his Age*, 1917  
 DINSDALE, M. S., *History of Latin Literature*, 1915  
 DUFF, J. WIGHT, *A Literary History of Rome to the Close of the Golden Age*, 7th ed., 1927  
 A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age, 1927  
 The Writers of Rome, 1925  
 GLOVER, T. R., *Studies in Virgil*, 5th ed., 1923  
 GRANDGENT, C. H., *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, 1908  
 LINDSAY, W. M., *The Latin Language*, 1894  
 A Short Historical Latin Grammar, 2nd ed., 1915  
 MACKAIL, J. W., *Latin Literature*, 1906  
 MERRY, W., *Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry*, 1891  
 NAIN, J. A., *Authors of Rome*, 1924  
 PICHON, RENE, *Histoire de la littérature latine*, 5th ed., 1912  
 PLESSIS, F., *La poésie latine*, 1909  
 SELLAH, W. Y., *Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, 1892  
 Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Virgil, 1891  
 Roman Poets of the Republic, 3rd ed., 1889  
 SUMMERS, W. C., *The Silver Age of Latin Literature*, 1920  
 WEISE, C., *Language and Character of the Roman People*, trs. H. A. Strong and A. Y. Campbell, 1909

## CHAPTER LXVII

### PAGANISM AND THE PHILOSOPHIES

- ARNOLD, E. V., *Roman Stoicism*, 1911  
 BERNARD, EDWARD R., *Great Moral Teachers (Epictetus)*, 1906  
 BEVAN, EDWYN, *Stoics and Sceptics*, 1913  
 CAIRD, E., *Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers*, 2 vols, 1904  
 EPICETUS, *Teaching of*, trs. T. W. Rolleston, 1911  
 INGE, W. R., *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, 1918  
 PLOTINUS, *Select Works*, Taylor's Trans., ed. G. R. S. Mead, 1914

## CHAPTER LXVIII

### THE FLOURISHING OF ART AND ARCHITECTURE

- ANDERSON, W. J., SPIERS, R. O., and ASHBY, T., *The Architecture of Ancient Rome*, new ed., 1927  
 HEKLER, A., *Greek and Roman Portraits*, 1912  
 MAU, A., *Pompeii*, trs. W. Kelsey, 1902  
 RIVOIRA, G. T., *Roman Architecture*, trs. G. McN. Rushforth, 1925  
 STRONG, Mrs. E., *Apotheosis and After-life*, 1915  
 Roman Sculpture, 2nd ed., 1911

- STRZYGOWSKI, J., *Orient oder Rom*, 1901  
 WALTERS, H. B., *The Art of the Romans*, 1906  
 WICKHOFF, A., *Roman Art*, trs. E. Strong, 1900

## CHAPTER LXIX

### THE FALL OF JERUSALEM AND ITS WORLD SIGNIFICANCE

- BENNETT, WILLIAM HENRY, *The Religion of the Post-exilic Prophets*, 1907  
 BEVAN, EDWYN, *Jerusalem under the High Priests*, 2nd ed., 1912  
 BROWNE, LAURENCE E., *Early Judaism*, 1920  
 ELSLIE, W. A. L., *Studies in Life from Jewish Proverbs*, 1917  
 GRAETZ, HIRSCH, *The History of the Jews*, frs. B. Lowy, 5 vols., 1891-92  
 HERFORD, ROBERT TRAVERS, *The Pharisees*, 1924  
 LEVY, REUBEN, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 1925  
 LOFTHOUSE, W. F., *The Prophet of Reconstruction (Ezekiel)*, 1920  
 MONTEFIORE, CLAUDE G., *The Old Testament and After*, 1923  
 MONTGOMERY, J. A., *The Samaritans*, 1907  
 MYERS, C. S., *Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity*, 1923  
 PEAKE, A. S., *The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*, 1904  
 PETERS, JOHN PUNNET, *Religion of the Hebrews*, 1914  
 SCHURER, EMIL, *History of the Jewish People*, trs. J. Macpherson, S. Taylor and P. Christie, 1890-91  
 SMITH, H. P., *Religion of Israel*, 1914

## CHAPTER LXX

### A ROMAN CITIZEN SURVEYS THE WORLD

- BOUCHIER, E. S., *Life and Letters in Roman Africa*, 1913  
 Spain under the Roman Empire, 1914  
 CHAPOT, V., *Le monde romain*, 1927  
 CHARLESWORTH, M.P., *Trade Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire*, 2nd ed., 1926  
 COLLINGWOOD, R. G., *Roman Britain*, 1923  
 FRANK, TENNEY, *An Economic History of Rome*, 2nd ed., 1927  
 HIRTH, F., *China and the Roman Orient*, 1885  
 LUCAS, C. P., *Greater Rome and Greater Britain*, 1912  
 MATHESON, P. E., *The Growth of Rome*, 1922  
 MOMMSEN, T., *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, trs. W. P. Dickson, 2 vols., 1909  
 NILSSON, M. P., *Imperial Rome*, trs. G. C. Richards, 1926  
 RANSAY, W. M., *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 5th ed., 1900  
 ROSTOVZEFF, M., *A History of the Ancient World*, Vol. II, Rome, 1927  
 Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, 1926

## CHAPTER LXXI

### DAY IN THE LIFE OF IMPERIAL ROME

- BECKER, W. A., *Gallus*, trs. F. Metcalf, 3rd ed., 1866  
 DILL, S., *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 2nd ed., 1919  
 GREENIDGE, A. H. J., *Roman Public Life*, 1901  
 HARDY, E. G., *Studies in Roman History*, 2nd ed., 1910 [1888]  
 INGE, W. R., *Society in Rome under the Caesars*, JONES, H. STUART, *The Roman Empire*, 1908  
 TUCKER, T. G., *Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul*, 1910

## Chronicle VI

### THE HELLENISTIC AGE:

360-280 B.C.

**F**OR a hundred years since the rise of Pericles to power at Athens, about 460, the struggle between Europe and Asia had been in abeyance, when Artaxerxes II (Mnemon) died (359 B.C.). Throughout that period the great empire organized by Darius the Great was tending slowly but surely to disruption. But Hellas was no nearer to unity than she had been a century before.

The dream of Pericles—if indeed we are right in thinking that he had dreamed it—of a mighty Hellas united through the moral and intellectual ascendancy of the city he idealised, had been dissolved by the internecine rivalries of the Greek states, and by the subordination of the pan-Hellenic idea to the individualist imperialism of Athens or Sparta or, finally, Thebes. In the west a great Hellenic power had arisen, but its might depended wholly on the genius of the man who had created it, Dionysius of Syracuse, and it hardly outlived his death. Hellenism was to permeate the world, not to conquer it.

Yet a conquest altogether unsuspected was near at hand, which was to be a mighty instrument for that permeation. Before another generation had passed, Europe was hurling herself upon Asia under the leadership of a power which posed at least as the champion of Hellenism, though itself, in the eyes of Hellas, scarcely half Hellenic. It shattered the old Persian Empire for ever. It carried Hellenism into the heart of Orientalism. It created a new empire vast beyond all previous vision, though one whose unity scarcely survived its creator, because he left no heir; and it changed the political order of the world.

This amazing achievement was the work of two men, Philip of Macedon and the son by whom his fame has been eclipsed, Alexander the Great.

Hitherto Macedon has made no more than an occasional appearance on the

fringe of the story of Hellas. It lay beyond the northern border of Thessaly—the limit of continental Hellas, though Hellenic colonies fringed the north coast of the Aegean. The Thracians, east of the Chalcidian promontories and the river Strymon, and the Illyrians of the western highlands, ranked definitely as barbarians, not Hellenes. The Macedonians proper, though of Hellenic stock, were unacknowledged; but their dynasty, the antiquity of which was unquestionable, claimed Heraclid descent, and had been recognized as legitimate competitors in the pan-Hellenic Games. On the other hand, while the Macedonian king ruled his Macedonian subjects with the absolute authority of a clan chieftain, his kingship extended over Illyrian clans, among whose chieftains he was merely the high chief. Macedonia's political development had therefore hardly passed out of the tribal stage; her organization remained primitive, though her territory was far greater than that of any Hellenic state; but her people provided admirable material for a great military organizer.

#### Awaiting the Man of Destiny

**S**UCH an organizer had not hitherto appeared; nor had Macedon been admitted to the comity of Hellas. When Xerxes poured his hosts into Greece her king Alexander had been among his vassals, though he had used his position to supply useful information to the Greeks. In the first stage of the Peloponnesian war we have seen another king, Perdiccas, fomenting troubles in the Chalcidian colonies in order to turn them to his own advantage. A successor had played his part first in fostering and then in wrecking the Chalcidian (Olynthian) League. But always the mainspring of Macedonia's activities had been not her Hellenic sympathies, but the pressure on her of the hill tribes of Paeonia on the north and Illyria on the west.

Now in 368 when Thebes was advancing to the hegemony of Greece, a disputed succession and northern frontier troubles in Macedonia had enabled the rising power to force on Macedon an alliance, guaranteed by the presence in Thebes, actually though not nominally as hostages, of several youthful members of the Macedonian nobility, including Philip (382-336), the younger brother of the young king Perdiccas. For three or four years the boy dwelt in Thebes, learning everything that was to be learnt of statecraft and military craft in the city of Epaminondas and Pelopidas. Then he was allowed to return to his own country.

Four years later (359), Perdiccas was slain in battle with the Paeonians, leaving a child, Amyntas, on the throne, with his uncle Philip, who was then twenty-three,

as guardian or regent. The hour and the man had arrived.

Philip was endowed by nature with a frame of iron, a clear head, a cool and calculating brain, boundless ambition, dauntless resolution and—in full measure—those moral virtues which can always reconcile themselves to the dictates of expediency. He was an astute diplomatist, and his natural military genius had been trained in the school of Epaminondas, the greatest captain and organizer yet seen in Hellas. Thus equipped, he set himself forthwith to work out step by step the task his ambition had marked out for him. Macedon was a minor power; she should be the greatest power in Hellas. Hellas had no leader, nor any state competent to lead her; Macedon should be that state. And then—Persia should go down



#### MACEDONIAN SPHERE OF INFLUENCE IN EUROPE BEFORE ALEXANDER

It was by military conquest that Philip incorporated Illyria, Paonia, Thracia and, last, Chalcidice in the kingdom of Macedonia. Diplomacy attached Epirus and Thessaly to his cause, and by his victory at Chaeronea he secured the hegemony of Hellas. After Philip's death Alexander crushed all Hellenic opposition and crossing the Hellespont proceeded with the conquest of Asia Minor. The entire ground covered in the ensuing Persian campaign is shown in the map in page 1422.

before Hellas. Stage by stage Philip marched toward his goal; the first stage being the making of Macedonia.

Pretenders to the throne which he had not yet seized himself had to be removed; a matter easily effected by cajoling their foreign supporters, including Athens, with illusory promises. Next, the Illyrians and Paeonians were to be dealt with; Philip spent the winter in training a Macedonian force, with which next year he shattered both in pitched battles. He employed the tactical principles he had learnt from Epaminondas, but with a modification of his own, never practised by the Greeks, the use of heavy cavalry in shock tactics on the wings; while his phalanx of spearmen was an improvement on the ordinary hoplite formation. The second victory gave him control of the Illyrian passes.

## Stages in Philip's Policy

**M**ONEY was the next necessity, for Macedonia was poor, her commerce being insignificant. But on the Thracian border there were unexploited mines. Again mainly by diplomatic cajolery, Philip possessed himself of those mines, from which he derived a larger revenue than any Greek state could boast; though it involved the absorption of Amphipolis in defiance of Athenian resentment. Athens was defeated simply by his superior skill in the game of diplomatic trickery, while he was also cajoling Olynthus into acquiescence. This stage of his work he completed by quietly deposing his infant nephew and ward (who afterwards married one of his daughters) and assuming the crown; and by organizing what might be called standing territorial regiments from his Illyrian highlanders—a material step towards producing a common national sentiment among his heterogeneous subjects.

The next stage was opened by an experimental intervention in the 'sacred war' of Phocis, by way of asserting his Hellenic position. Phocis, hitherto a somewhat insignificant state, but always jealous of her powerful neighbour Thebes, had suddenly asserted and enforced a traditional but unrecognized claim to Delphi and the guardianship of its shrine (see also page 1399). Her claim was opposed by



COIN OF AN EMPIRE BUILDER

Born 382 B.C., Philip II usurped the crown of Macedonia in 359 and devoted his genius to the creation of a Macedonian army which should establish his supremacy in Greece and shatter the power of Persia. He was assassinated in 336 B.C.

*British Museum*

Thebes and by the Thessalians, but supported by Athens and Sparta, while her enemies charged her with sacrilege for turning to her own use the treasures of Apollo. Phocis bought over the powerful but unpopular tyrant of the Thessalian state of Pherae; the rest of Thessaly appealed to Philip, who marched against Pherae with a small force, as the champion of the outraged deity.

The Phocians marched to aid their ally in superior force, defeated Philip, and compelled him to withdraw. He returned with a larger army and put them to rout; but they were in possession of the pass of Thermopylae; Athenians and Spartans came to their help, and Philip again retired. His hour had not yet come, and for some time he again devoted himself to extending and consolidating his power in the northern regions where the intention of his operations was less immediately conspicuous; though they were alarming enough to those who suspected him of a desire to 'enslave' Hellas.

Philip did not wish to enslave Hellas even to such an extent as the democratic imperialists of Athens or the Lacedaemonians at the height of their power. But he did want in the first place to make his own kingdom an irresistible power; and whereas it had hitherto stood practically outside Hellas, he was determined that it should now be recognized not only as an integral part of Hellas, but as its leader and accepted champion. He seems to have had the same kind of sentimental reverence for Hellas, and especially for Athens, as in a later age was felt towards



Rome by the barbarian princes who deliberately elected to act as Lieutenants of the Empire instead of as conquerors. But it was only as the acknowledged head of Hellas that he could lead her to the great adventure to which not Athens nor Sparta nor Thebes was capable of leading her—the overthrow of Persia. To that end he must have the co-operation of Hellas, but no rivals.

Above all, he wanted the willing co-operation of Athens and her fleet; and it would have been sound policy for Athens to have accepted the rôle of his honoured coadjutor, since she had proved herself incapable of holding the position of accepted leader. Unfortunately, there was in Athens a patriot party which dreamed impossibly of a Periclean revival and, seeing that its own aspirations were incompatible with Philip's, made a point of thwarting him, and convinced itself that his concealed aim was the ruin of Athens—actually the last thing he desired. This

party was led by an orator of extraordinary power, Demosthenes, in whose eyes the Macedonian menace was infinitely more important than Persian policy, and his impassioned rhetoric has done much to discredit very unduly the character and aims of the great Macedonian, whose actual treatment of Athens was always more than generous.

Philip now rapidly effected a partial conquest of Thrace—an apparent threat to the Chersonese and the Athenian command of the Propontis; a serious matter for Athens, as she was largely dependent on corn supplies imported from those regions. But Philip did not attack the Chersonese; his next objective was the Chalcidian peninsula. In 348 he captured Olynthus, Athens being prevented from effectively interfering by the revolt of Euboea.

#### Philip Secures Hellenic Status

**P**EACE negotiations were then opened between Athens and Philip, who meant to carry out his programme of suppressing the sacrilegious Phocis and taking her place in the Amphictyonic Council, which might be called the official religious synod of Hellas. He was not at all afraid of Athens, but he was prepared to make large concessions to her to secure her good will and support. The terms of the Peace of Philocrates (346) were duly arranged, but before completion Demosthenes succeeded in breaking relations. Philip went on his way, pending the acceptance by Athens of a modified treaty; but she could not make up her mind on a policy; consequently Philip effected his object without her, suppressed Phocis, and became not only a member but president of the Amphictyonic Council. His Hellenic status was thus established. Athens was reduced to a sulkily acquiescence (346).

Hellas, however, was still a long way from being reconciled to a Macedonian hegemony, and though Philip had shown unmistakable proofs of his power, and incidentally of his moderation, it was still not sufficiently consolidated to enable him to undertake the grand project of his ambitions. The incorporation of a loyal Thrace with his own kingdom was a necessary precaution. Internal dissen-



PERFERVERID ATHENIAN PATRIOT

A full length statue of Demosthenes (c. 385-322 B.C.) appears in page 1360. This portrait bust gives a clearer impression of the dynamic personality which made him so formidable an obstacle in the way of Macedonian expansion.

Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen

sions in that region gave him his chance in 342, though the conquest, of the details of which we have no knowledge (except that Philip lost an eye in battle), must have put both his military and diplomatic powers to a severe test. In 341 Thrace became a part of the Macedonian kingdom. Within Hellas the Thessalian league had named him its president, and on the west of Thessaly his influence was supreme in the almost barbarian kingdom of Epirus, where he had established on the throne the brother of his Epirote wife Olympias.

Meanwhile, however, Demosthenes had been exerting his powers to the utmost to rouse animosity against him, not in Athens only, and in Athens against all politicians who inclined to the Macedonian alliance. The fever of suspicion was generally rife. In 340, Philip was reluctantly goaded into war.

Athens could not be threatened by sea, but her sea power could not work effective injury to Macedon, as to her Peloponnesian foes in the days of Pericles; on the other hand, against Macedon in alliance with Thebes, Attica was by land entirely defenceless. Philip was in no haste to strike; but the development of a sacred war on Amphissa, the ally of Thebes, by the Amphictyonic Council which called for Philip's support, brought him down to Boeotia with an army in 338, and simultaneously threw Thebes into the arms of Athens. The result was that he met the combined armies on the field of Chaeronea and put them completely to rout, the picked troops of Thebes alone remaining on the ground and fighting to the last.

**B**UT the magnanimity of the victor shows how groundless were the denunciations of Demosthenes. Chaeronea gave the hegemony of Hellas to Macedon as indisputably as Leuctra had given it to Thebes. Philip was manifestly irresistible, but he did not proceed to the enslavement of Hellas; he dealt with Thebes no more harshly than Sparta had dealt with her in the past, and Demosthenes himself admitted that his treatment of Athens was generous. But the situation differed from any that had existed before; because Macedon was not a state with an Hellenic



THE LION OF CHAERONEA

On August 2, 338 B.C., Philip of Macedon routed the combined armies of Thebes and Athens at Chaeronea in Boeotia and destroyed the independence of Greece. This colossal lion, restored in 1902, marks the burial place of the Theban dead.

*Photo, E.N.A.*

tradition behind it, and was not a city state at all, but a great territorial despotic monarchy without parallel in Hellas.

Thebes, which had elected to desert the Macedonian alliance, was not unreasonably penalised. The Boeotian league was broken up and the independence of the cities restored. A Macedonian garrison occupied the Cadmeia, the citadel of Thebes, and the party that favoured Philip was installed in power. Sparta, which sulkily refused to join the Hellenic league designed by Philip for the overthrow of Persia, suffered the overrunning of Laconia and the transfer of some of her territory to former foes or subjects. From Athens Philip required no more than the Chersonese, the dissolution

of what remained of her maritime league, and her entry into the new League of Hellas; the Athenian prisoners taken at Chaeronea were restored without ransom.

At last the way was clear. Philip summoned a pan-Hellenic congress at Corinth; all the states except the still sulky Sparta were represented. At the congress in 337 he declared his great project—the pan-Hellenic war, which had been impracticable for a divided Hellas, upon the Asiatic empire which had sought and would still seek to enslave Hellenes. The congress assented—it could hardly do otherwise—and settled upon ways and means with no great enthusiasm; but it was enough for the man who would have the whole direction of the adventure, the grand ambition of his life, in his own hands.

#### Assassination of Philip of Macedon

As a military organizer, as a strategist, as a commander in the field, Greece had never produced the superior of Philip, unless it were his unconscious master Epaminondas. As a matter of course he was made captain-general of the Hellenic forces with practically unlimited powers. For twelve months after the congress he was engaged in organization; the fleet of Athens, though latterly her admirals had displayed no distinguished ability, commanded the Aegean. In the spring of 336 he dispatched the man whom he called his only general, Parmenio, to secure the passage of his armies into the north-western corner of Asia Minor; in the summer he was on the very point of following with his main force when he was struck down by the hand of an assassin, probably the emissary or agent of his wronged and repudiated wife Olympias, the mother of his mighty son. For a moment the great expedition was deferred.

To the victor of Chaeronea unwilling Hellas had bowed the knee perforce; more sore at being dominated by one imperious will than eager to do battle with the ancient foe at his bidding. Philip fell when he was in the plenitude of his powers, but no more than forty-six years old. His heir was a lad of twenty, who no doubt had shown his mettle at Chaeronea; but everywhere Philip had

subjects, dependents or positive enemies who were ready enough to rise up against an untried youth whose title even to his own throne it was possible to dispute. In Athens and elsewhere the murder of Philip was hailed with premature acclamations. There were Thracian tribes eager to revolt, Illyrian tribes whom the fear of the dead man had curbed. Had there been even the briefest delay Alexander would have found himself in the centre of a general conflagration.

But the delay was not given. Before his enemies could combine, though not before they were in open revolt, he had swung his Macedonians down to the Thessalian border, outflanked the pass of Tempe, carved a road through the mountains, and swept into the plain. Thessaly submitted without a blow. Athens made repentant overtures which were accepted without demur. The League made haste to appoint him captain-general in succession to his father.

#### Destruction of Thebes by Alexander

THE Thracian insurgents were dealt with in a swift campaign in the early summer of 335; but meanwhile the Illyrians were gathering to attack Macedonia. For a few weeks Alexander vanished in the Illyrian mountains. The rumour spread that he had been slain in Thrace; an eye-witness of his fall was produced. Thebes gave the lead in revolting; half Hellas was preparing to follow. But by movements of unparalleled audacity and swiftness Alexander and his Macedonians had in fact shattered the Illyrians, and even while Thebes still believed that he was dead, he appeared at her gates and summoned her to surrender. A hot-headed Macedonian captain seized an opportunity to break into the town without waiting for orders; Alexander threw in supports; the Thebans fought stubbornly but vainly, and the city suffered the common fate of cities carried by storm, although 'The great Emathian conqueror bade spare the house of Pindarus,' the famed poet of old. But the destruction of Thebes was the work of her age-long foes in Locris and Boeotia far more than of the Macedonians.

The smiting of Thebes sufficed. Every one else made prompt submission, and Alexander exacted no penalties. In spite of all, he chose to trust that magnanimity would be answered by loyalty. But it was fear, not loyalty, that held Hellenic jealousies in check. Fear, however, was so thoroughly established that in the next year, 334, Alexander could turn his back on Europe, and was over the Hellespont with the army of conquest. The great adventure had begun—an adventure of such transcendent interest that a special study chapter is devoted to it, and it will here be sufficient to give a mere summary of its outstanding incidents.

The attack was fully expected in Persia. But the Great King's government had sunk back to its normal ineptitude under the amiable but futile Darius III Codomannus. For twenty years, while Philip was building up the Macedonian power, Artaxerxes III Ochus had ruled forcefully, reconquered Egypt, kept his satraps in awe, and permitted rather than maintained the general peace and prosperity of his empire. Greek states had seldom been ashamed to seek Persian aid in their private quarrels, and appeals were, of course, made to him against Macedon, but he did not care to precipitate a rupture with Philip, though it suited him well enough to have Greeks in his pay. In 338, however, he was slain by an assassin, like Philip two years later; Darius had secured the succession only in 336 and was quite unfitted to save the empire.

### Opening of the Persian Campaign

**M**ONEY had been sent to Greece; but the defence of the west was left to the western satraps in joint and jealous association with an able Greek adventurer, Memnon of Rhodes. Alexander's task would have been made much harder if Memnon had been in supreme command. Alexander met and routed the army of the satraps on the river Granicus. The battle (fully described in Chap. 46) left Asia Minor open to conquest.

The mastery of Syria and Phoenicia was the next step. Having made Asia Minor sufficiently secure, Alexander struck through the 'Cilician gates,' the passage

of the Taurus barrier, and spent some months in reducing Cilicia. Then he moved south. Meanwhile Darius had taken the field in person with a vast army, and was on the borders of Cilicia expecting his attack. At Issus (332) the Persian was decisively defeated and fled for his life behind the Euphrates.

### Alexander Advances to Babylon

**I**NSTEAD of immediate pursuit Alexander went forward with the conquests he had immediately in view. When Tyre was won the whole navy of Persia was in his hands. Egypt in turn welcomed him as a deliverer. Not till 331 did he turn to complete the overthrow of Persia. For the details of this triumphant campaign, as for those of the Granicus and the Issus, the reader may refer to Chapter 46. The battle of Gaugamela, some miles from the old Nineveh, was overwhelmingly decisive. Though again Darius escaped from the field with his life, for the little that remained of it he was no better than a hunted fugitive.

The conqueror marched on to Babylon, which opened its gates to him. But Persia and Media, whence the empire of Cyrus had arisen, were still unsubdued, and Darius was still at large in his ancestral lands. It was in Alexander's view imperative to seize the royal residences, Susa and Ecbatana, and the political capital, Persepolis, which meant an advance by way of difficult and dangerous mountain passes. Of such operations Alexander's early experiences in Illyria had made him a past master. Susa had already been occupied by an advance column, and in a winter campaign (331-30) he captured Persepolis and Pasargadae, the first home of the great Cyrus, together with vast treasures, including spoils which Xerxes had carried off from Athens and which were now restored to her.

Even now he gave Darius and the Persian loyalists time to offer submission before advancing on Ecbatana. But they were determined to offer a final resistance. When the blow could no longer be delayed, he struck with his wonted swiftness; but when he reached Ecbatana, the heart of Darius had failed

him, and he was already in full flight. Alexander was soon in hot pursuit; but before he could overtake the fugitive, treachery was at work, and the fallen monarch was murdered by Bessus, satrap of Bactria (July, 330).

#### Achaemenid Empire Overthrown

THE Macedonian, or as he himself would have said the Hellene, had taken the place so long held by the Persian. Politically he followed, though with a difference, the precedents established by the great Cyrus and Darius, not by a Tiglath-pileser or a Nebuchadrezzar; he conquered not to enslave but to incorporate and develop; fostering and even reviving, local traditions and customs, and installing native administrators wherever it was reasonably safe to do so, never penalising loyalty to his defeated antagonist, however sternly he might deal with Hellenic renegades. His foundation of Alexandria in Egypt was only the most distinguished example of a definite and statesmanlike policy, and his selection of its site as the world's central mart was in itself a mark of genius.

But there was more to be done besides the overthrow of the Achaemenid, whose ineffective rule over the wilder regions east and south-east must be made effective. The conquest of Persia, Persia proper, had begotten new imaginations. The very dissolution of the immemorial barriers between Hellene and Barbarian, the actual amalgamation of East and West, would seem to have become from this time more and more an integral part of Alexander's incredible dream.

Persia was won, but the eastern provinces or—what came to the same thing—their satraps, who had conspired to murder Darius, were in revolt. Their intention had been to set Bessus, who called himself Artaxerxes, in the place of their victim. Alexander started on his far eastern campaigns with the double object of establishing his sway over the whole empire and avenging the murder of his royal predecessor. On his march, which was in the nature of an armed exploration in regions of which little was known, there were risky adventures, astonishing marching feats, and brilliant exploits; but there

was no foe who could make a stand against his army. He penetrated Afghanistan, struck north through the Hindu Kush into Turkistan, captured Bessus, who died the death of an oriental traitor (crucifixion, preceded by mutilation), and thrust beyond the bounds of the empire across the Oxus (Amu Daria) to Samarkand. On the way new Alexandrias arose, meant to be the centres of a new civilization; Herat, Kandahar and Kabul are among the probable sites. He planted his extreme outpost, Alexandria Eschaté, 'Farthest Alexandria,' on the banks of the Jaxartes (at Khojend). Before he had completed the subjugation, he captured the Scythian chief Oxyartes, with his daughter, the famous Roxana, whom Alexander wedded according to the Scythian rite: the most conspicuous method possible of illustrating in his own person the cosmopolitan theories he was so anxious to impress upon the Macedonians.

#### Alexander's Conquest of the Punjab

THERE still remained unvisited and unsubdued one dim region, 'India,' over which the Achaemenids from Darius I to Darius III had claimed sovereignty; to which the conqueror now turned (327). Afghanistan was already secured, and the winter was passed in subjugating the hill tribes of what we know as the North-west Frontier. That is to say, the war-worn veterans fought their way through the unexplored passes till in the spring of 326 they came down to the Indus, crossed it, and routed the hosts of the confederate princes of the Punjab in the great battle of Hydaspes—the river Jhelum (for details see Chap. 46). Not until the battle had been lost beyond hope of redemption did Porus, the indomitable chief of the confederacy, surrender himself to Alexander, who treated him with well-deserved royal honours, appointing him sub-king of the major part of the Punjab, under the aegis of himself, the Great King.

But the Punjab was to be the limit of Alexander's conquest; very much against his own will. For when the advancing army reached the Hyphasis (the Beas), which flows into the Sutlej, the last of the

Five Rivers that give its name to the Punjab, not even its hero Alexander could persuade it to move a step farther. He had no choice but to turn back.

But Alexander was an explorer at heart ; and before returning he had already resolved on an expedition down the Indus, to be followed up by the navigation of the Indian ocean—the latter task to be entrusted to Nearchus. The southern tribes resisted the advance ; and it was where Multan stands to-day that in the assault on the citadel Alexander, first as usual up the scaling ladder, went near to meeting his death.

When the Indus mouth was reached, the fleet of Nearchus was fitted out and he was dispatched on the voyage of exploration westwards. The main army made its way back to Afghanistan by the Bolan pass ; the rest of the force, led by the king, plunged into the almost uninhabited Gedrosia, or southern Baluchistan, and struggled through in little more than half its original strength, after cruel sufferings which the king shared with his soldiers.

**T**HIS expedition was in 325. Meanwhile Nearchus had explored the coasts from Karachi to the Persian Gulf, Craterus had suppressed the revolts, and before the end of the year both had joined Alexander in Carmania (Kirman), the rendezvous, on the east of Persia. Already the king had been long enough away for satraps and officials, Macedonian and Persian, to take advantage of an absence which might be permanent, and misuse their powers. On all such his hand now fell with stern justice, even-handed and unsparing. His treasurer Harpalus saved himself, not empty-handed, by fleeing.

The career of conquest was suspended. In 324. Alexander, already wedded to

Roxana, took also to wife Statira, the daughter of Darius ; and many Macedonians, following his example, also married Persian women. Alexander further emphasised his theory of cancelling racial

barriers by organizing not only regiments of Orientals trained in the Greek discipline and commanded by Persians, but also regiments in which easterns and westerns were combined. He was even now planning maritime adventures and expansion on the newly discovered ocean, and the annexation of Arabia over which the Persian conquest had never extended ; and early in 323 the preparations were well advanced. He had made Babylon his headquarters, when in June a fever seized him. Within a fortnight he died, leaving no man capable of building the structure he had designed on the foundations he had laid.



**MACEDONIAN RULER OF ASIA**

Seleucus Nicator, one of Alexander's generals, made himself king of Syria in 301 ; and thereafter ruled most of the Asiatic provinces once included in Alexander's empire.

*From Delbrück, 'Lutike Porträts'*

The fatal fact in the situation brought about by Alexander's sudden death was that there was no heir with an indisputable title to the succession, though a child by Roxana was expected, and there was a feeble son of the great Philip, Alexander's half-brother, known to the world as Philip Arrhidaeus.

A council of the generals decided to recognize Philip, with whom Roxana's son, if (as actually happened) a son should be born, was to be associated. They were to be under the guardianship of Perdiccas, a general high in Alexander's confidence, whom the dead king may have intended to designate as his heir. In the meantime the empire was to be distributed among the leading Macedonians in governorships over-riding the satrapies. Antipater was to retain the regency of Macedonia and Greece which Alexander had left in his charge eleven years ago ; Egypt was to go to Ptolemy, the satrap of

Babylon to Seleucus, who already held it, Thrace and part of Asia Minor to Lysimachus, most of western Asia to Antigonos, and the rest to Leonnatus and Eumenes; while the guardianship of Philip and of the baby Alexander, together with an independent military command, placed Perdiccas in a position at least of equality with the rest.

This, or something like this, was the only possible way of dealing with an unprecedented situation. It could not last because it provided no dominant central authority, the nearest thing to such an authority being that of Perdiccas. Even so supreme a personality as Alexander's could not have maintained the system long. The much smaller satrapies of the Persian empire, under a dynasty whose authority had been established for a century and a half, had been a constant menace to the unity of that empire. This emergency system was possible only so long as the several generals stood loyally by each other; it was inevitable that sooner or later personal ambitions and rivalries would undermine loyalty; and so in fact it befell in a very short time.

The half century following Alexander's death in 323 rings with the clash of strife between the Diadochi, the 'Successors,'



#### BESIEGER OF CITIES

Son of Antigonos who became king of Asia on Alexander's death, Demetrius gained his surname, Poliorcetes (the Besieger), from the machines constructed by him to break down the defence of Rhodes in 304 B.C. He died in 283 B.C.

From G. F. Hill, 'Select Greek Coins'

Macedonians who were seeking to obtain the lion's share in the partition of the vast dominion, and setting up dynasties of their own, each battling to overshadow his neighbour's power. Only by 280 (to sum up in anticipation) was something like a final settlement emerging, with the house of Seleucus (who was murdered in that year) established in Syria, Babylonia and part of Asia Minor, the Ptolemies reigning in Egypt, and the house of Antigonos not yet finally secured as kings of Macedon and sovereigns over Greece (see map in page 405). Native or minor Macedonian dynasties were in the meantime shaping kingdoms over the greater part of Anatolia. In Cappadocia Ariarathes, a Persian or a native, was king; in Pontus on the shore of the Euxine, Mithradates, the grandson of the Persian satrap Ariobarzanes; in Bithynia a native, Nicomedes; and Pergamum, held by the Macedonian Philetaerus, first in fief to Lysimachus and then independently, was soon to become a kingdom under his nephew Attalus.

Of the generals named in the first partition, Ptolemy, Lysimachus and Seleucus were active almost through the whole period, dying respectively in 283, 281 and 280; Antipater and Antigonos, older men,



#### VICTORY COINAGE OF DEMETRIUS

Demetrius Poliorcetes commemorated his naval victories on several coins, using as the design the statue of Victory which he dedicated in 305 B.C. It was this coin that led to the identification of the statue shown in the opposite page.

From G. F. Hill, 'Select Greek Coins,' G. Van Oost

died in 319 and 301; all five, however, at about eighty years of age. The two last were represented after their deaths by their sons Cassander and Demetrius Poliorcetes the 'Besieger'; the death of Cassander's three sons gave Macedon to their Antigoniid rival. When Lysimachus fell in battle with Seleucus, he left no heir to his claims. Perdikkas and Eumenes had been eliminated two years after Alexander's death; and Leonnatus, who had saved Alexander's life in Multan, was killed in battle still earlier (see below). Neither he nor Craterus entered into the rivalries.

While Alexander was conquering Asia, Hellas had remained for the most part quiescent, suffering under a sense of subjection (though its liberties were not touched in fact), because it knew that it enjoyed those liberties only by grace of the Macedonian. The Spartan king Agis did indeed try to incite a

war of liberation, but he found no support, even from Demosthenes, outside the Peloponnese, and was easily suppressed by the regent Antipater. Athens, with still expanding commerce and her finances under very able direction, was particularly prosperous, while the great orator was wise enough not to play the fire-brand. Even when Harpalus, Alexander's rapacious ex-treasurer, fleeing from his master's righteous wrath, appeared on the scene with much treasure, hoping to stir up a revolt by bribery, the counsels of prudence prevailed; though the failure of Demosthenes to take



**NIKE OF SAMOTHRACE: AN EARLY HELLENISTIC MASTERPIECE**

Early Hellenistic art created nothing more beautiful than this Victory statue found in Samothrace. It commemorates a naval victory—possibly of Antigonus Gonatas of Macedonia—and was carved by a third century Rhodian sculptor in imitation of the earlier statue set up by Demetrius Poliorcetes as stated opposite. The goddess Nike stands half flying on the prow of a warship; as shown in the reconstruction (left) she probably bore a wreath in her right hand and a standard in her left.

*Left, after Falus and Cordonnier; right, the Louvre*



proper charge of the money sequestered from the rebel, which was entrusted to his care, caused his banishment (324).

An immediate change, however, was wrought by the death of Alexander. In Athens the patriot party at once became dominant, and assumed that rôle of leader in a war of liberation in which Agis had failed. This time it was the Peloponnesians who held aloof. The aged Antipater came down to suppress Athens and her allies in Thessaly, but was defeated and shut up in Lamia, which gave its name to the 'Lamian' war. Leonnatus came to his aid from the Propontis, but was defeated and slain. Triumphant, Athens recalled Demosthenes. But the triumph was brief. Craterus appeared on the scene, and at Crannon (322) routed the allies, who had lost their ablest leader, the Athenian Leosthenes. The resistance collapsed, and Antipater was able to dictate his own terms to the allies, not as a league but individually.

#### Tragic End of Demosthenes

THE Athenian democracy was restricted by a narrow franchise, a Macedonian garrison was placed in the port of Munychia, and the surrender of Demosthenes was demanded. The great orator, the life-long foe of Macedon, took sanctuary in the temple of Poseidon at Calauraea, where he swallowed poison, so escaping the vengeance of his enemies.

Demosthenes was the most brilliant of orators and the most fervent of Athenian patriots. All through his life the policy he urged on his countrymen was based on his ineradicable conviction that Macedon was the enemy of Athens, in spite of the unflinching magnanimity with which she was always treated by both Philip and Alexander. He was the incarnation of that attitude of the Greek mind which made the unification of Hellas impossible, because no Greek state was willing, except in extreme emergency, to accept the control of a common federal authority or the hegemony of any state other than itself. But so great was his rhetorical genius, so vigorous his conviction that he was right, and that all men who opposed him were traitors, that his eloquence has

often persuaded posterity almost as thoroughly as the Athenian juries, not seldom in defiance of sober evidence.

Little more than a year had passed since the death of Alexander, but the incompatible ambitions of the generals were already manifesting themselves. The obvious intention of Perdiccas, as guardian of the feeble-minded Philip and the baby Alexander, and ally of the old queen Olympias and the young queen Roxana, to secure the supreme authority for himself, led four of the other Diadochi—Antipater, Antigonus, Ptolemy and Seleucus—to form a league against him. In 321 Perdiccas marched against Ptolemy in Egypt, but was assassinated. Antipater was nominated regent, but the old man died in 318, his death causing a fresh complication, since he named as his successor not his own aspiring son Cassander, but another old general, Polysperchon; between whom and Cassander there was war, with Macedon and Greece as a battle-ground. While Seleucus was busying himself in the far eastern provinces, more intent on carrying out Alexander's policy than on fighting for Alexander's crown, Antigonus was making himself more and more supreme in Asia.

#### Discussions Among the Diadochi

BY 316, Philip and his valorous and energetic wife, Eurydice, had been done away with by fierce old Olympias; she herself had been put to death by Cassander; Polysperchon's career was ended; and Cassander was dominant in Europe. In the course of this struggle another notable Athenian, Phocion, ended a long and honourable but not a successful career. A man of ability, but not of brilliant talents, he was one of those whose character at once compels respect and admiration and forbids popularity; who was always by preference on the unpopular side, and most doubted his own wisdom when it was most applauded; who never pandered to popular sentiment; always just but always unsympathetic. He disliked because he mistrusted the democracy which rarely listened to his sensible but uninspiring advice, which habitually aimed at amicable relations with Macedon. At

the age of eighty-five he was condemned to death for treason after the travesty of a trial by his political enemies, and drank his hemlock with the serenity of Socrates. Characteristically, the Athenians raised a statue to his memory.

From 315 to 307, war was going on with little intermission between Antigonos, now the most powerful of the Diadochi, and his rivals. In 307 his son Demetrius, who had not yet earned his nickname (*Poliorketes*), entered the field in his support, invading Greece, which was in the hands of Cassander and his ally Ptolemy, in the character of liberator. Roxana and the boy Alexander had been murdered some years before by Cassander, so that there was now no one with any pretence to a title to the imperial throne. In 306, Antigonos assumed for himself and Demetrius the title of king, an example promptly followed by Lysimachus, Ptolemy, Cassander and Seleucus. Demetrius set about the siege of Rhodes where his novel but unsuccessful operations won him his name of *Poliorketes*. The war went on with varying fortunes, till in 301 the old Antigonos was slain at the battle of Ipsus in Phrygia, and a fresh compromise was reached, under which Asia was practically divided between Lysimachus and Seleucus, while Demetrius and Cassander were left to fight out their rivalry in Europe, with the leaderless Greek states as pawns in their game.

Still the welter of wars and murders continued. Cassander died; his eldest son, known as Philip IV, died; the two younger sons disputed the succession, and



### A VICTIM OF INGRATITUDE

Phocion (402-317 B.C.) was a good soldier and a sincere patriot. Yet despite his fine military career and high integrity he became suspect in Athens and, like Socrates, drank the hemlock.

*The Vatican, Rome*

the younger, Alexander, called in to his aid a new ally, Pyrrhus (318-272), the famous king of Epirus, whose grandfather had been the brother of Olympias. Meanwhile Demetrius had attacked Athens, once his ally, then the ally of Cassander, and captured the city when it had been starved out at last after a long siege. He, too, went ostensibly to the aid of Alexander, between whom and his brother Pyrrhus had already divided Macedon; but Demetrius assassinated his ally and seized the throne himself (294).

'The Besieger,' however, aimed at the recovery of his father's dominion, which was now shared between Lysimachus and Seleucus. He was on friendly enough terms with the latter, who quite recently, though past sixty, had married Demetrius' young daughter Stratonice, being himself some twenty years older than his father-in-law. But

the effect of Demetrius' obvious preparations for war was to bring down on him in 287 both Lysimachus and Pyrrhus, who was immensely popular with the Macedonian soldiery. Demetrius had to fly to Asia, where he fell into the hands of Seleucus, who held him in honourable and opulent captivity till his death in 283. His claims descended to his son Antigonos Gonatas; but Pyrrhus seized the throne, only to be ejected again after a seven months' reign by Lysimachus. We shall find Pyrrhus on his next appearance (see Chronicle VII) engaged on an adventure in quite another quarter.

Old Ptolemy Soter died in 283, having abdicated two years before in favour of



PTOLEMY II AND QUEEN ARSINOË

Ptolemy II Philadelphus (309-246 B.C.) succeeded to the throne of Egypt on his father's abdication in 285 B.C. Although they were Greeks the early Ptolemies adopted all the habits of the Egyptian Pharaohs, and were represented by the Egyptian sculptors in the conventional pharaonic style, as on this bas-relief.

*British Museum*

his younger son Ptolemy II, called Philadelphus, to the wrath of the elder half-brother, Ptolemy Ceraunus. Only Seleucus and Lysimachus were left of the original Diadochi. They were very soon fighting each other; but Lysimachus was killed at the battle of Corupedium (281). Seleucus was master of the situation and proposed to end his days in Macedon where he had not set foot for fifty years, leaving the East to his son Antiochus Soter and reserving Thrace for the grandchildren of Lysimachus; but while he was passing through Thrace he was murdered by Ceraunus; who was hailed as king by the army (280)—to be driven out again two years later by Antigonos Gonatas.

Seleucus passed through all the wars of the Diadochi with cleaner hands than any of the rest, except Antipater, whose

age saved him from being involved in any but the first contest with Perdiccas. As a young man he was said to have performed the Herculean feat of wrestling with an enraged bull and throwing it; he was a soldier of distinguished courage and capacity. But more than this, he was the one man among Alexander's generals who seriously strove to carry out Alexander's ideals, stood by his engagements, and took what was his due and no more in the various settlements. He had no hand in any of the assassinations unless perhaps that of Perdiccas. To his share had fallen little but the most remote and least coveted eastern provinces, till the fall of Antigonos at Ipsus gave him Syria, from which the kingdom of the Seleucids took its name. He sowed Hellenism in the East, founding over seventy cities or settlements with that intent, the most important being Antioch, which he made his capital. But he had to abandon the attempt to retain India within the bounds of the empire, and to be content to

establish friendly if distant diplomatic relations with the mighty Maurya kingdom of Magadha, to whose story we now pass.

**I**N the fourth century B.C., as from the days of the first Darius, the Achæmenids had claimed a shadowy sovereignty in India, which perhaps meant that beyond the Indus, the probable boundary of the official satrapy, there were princes or communities in the Punjab that paid occasional tribute and sent occasional contingents to serve in the armies of the Great King. All over the basins of the Indus and the Ganges there were innumerable groups, principalities or federations, with boundaries expanding or contracting according to the aggressive vigour of their rulers, more or less subject to the sovereignty of any neighbouring power or

dynasty strong enough to enforce tribute. In the time of Alexander, the Nanda dynasty of Magadha (Bihar) held such rule over the Ganges area; and with that power Alexander would have come into collision had he crossed the Sutlej. Brahmanism or Hinduism was everywhere dominant; but the reformed or reforming religions—Jainism and Buddhism (see Chapter 40)—were wide-spread, diminishing the influence of caste; both the Nandas and their subverter Chandragupta, whom the Greeks called Sandracottys, have been claimed as Jains, though the mild ethics of Jainism are not easily recognizable in the life of Chandragupta, whose guide and minister was Chanakya, the Brahman prototype of Machiavelli.

### Macedonia's Hold on India Lost

ALEXANDER had doubtless hoped to make the Punjab a base from which to extend his conquest; but on the news of his death, young Chandragupta, probably a junior prince of the royal house, attacked and expelled the Macedonian garrisons in the Punjab, and, immediately before or after this exploit, exterminated his Nanda kinsmen and made himself king of Magadha—the first of the Maurya dynasty—reigning from 322 to 298. Ten years later Seleucus planned a reconquest; but by this time the king's power was consolidated. Seleucus realized the impracticability of his project, and Chandragupta was amicably recognized as independent monarch of India with Afghanistan and Baluchistan; while by way of compensation he presented Seleucus with five hundred elephants. Alexander's name (Iskander) survived in Indian memory; Megasthenes, on a mission from Seleucus, visited the Maurya court; Greeks appear from time to time in the north-west region; but there was no later attempt at conquest, and the influence of Hellenism in India was small though there are indications of Indian origins in some aspects of later western religions. (See Chap. 49 and the map in page 1490.)

Chandragupta established a great empire extending from Herat to Bengal and to the river Narbada, ruling as an absolute despot according to the maxims of

Chanakya which exalt force and cunning above all moral principles in state-craft. In 298 he abdicated and was succeeded by his son Bindusara (d. 273), the father of the great Asoka, whom we shall meet in the next Chronicle.

Western Hellas took no part in the adventure of Alexander or the rivalries of the Diadochi. Within a few years after the death of Dionysius I of Syracuse, his empire was in dissolution; Syracuse and Sicily generally became an arena in which tyrants and would-be tyrants struggled for the mastery. Carthage was on the point of turning the situation to her own advantage, when Corinth sent the noblest of her sons, Timoleon, to the deliverance of her daughter city.

Timoleon's character and abilities were of the highest; but he had retired from public life because his exalted sense of duty had compelled him to sanction the death of his own brother, who had sought to make himself tyrant at Corinth. Now he accepted the charge laid upon him (344), and achieved splendid success. He set Syracuse free, finally expelling Dionysius II. With a force of twelve thousand men he attacked and shattered on the Crimesus (339) a Carthaginian army of invasion, of six times his numbers,



### SAVIOR OF HIS COUNTRY

Seleucus Nicator's son, Antiochus, was called Soter (Savior) from his repulse of the Gauls who invaded Asia Minor in 278 B.C. He died in 262 B.C., after a reign troubled by wars with Syria, Egypt and Pergamum.

*From G. F. Hill, "Select Greek Coins," G. Van Oort.*



PERSONIFICATION OF ANTIOCH

Crowned with a mural crown, with a bunch of corn ears in her hand and the river Orontes under her feet, this figure symbolises the Tyche or Fortune of Antioch, founded in 300 B.C. by Seleucus Nicator. Copy of 3rd century bronze. *The Vatican*

removing that danger almost for another generation; he cleared the cities of Sicily of their tyrants; and when his work was finished in 338 he claimed no reward, but simply laid down the powers he had so admirably exercised; though for the year or two of life that remained to him his counsels were eagerly sought, freely given and zealously obeyed.

Nevertheless, the political instability of Sicilian Hellas was incurable. In 317 another tyrant arose in Syracuse, Agathocles. The 'master' of Syracuse—for his self-chosen title is that used later by Greek historians to translate the Roman terms 'dictator' and 'imperator'—had been born a Carthaginian subject, at the 'Baths of Himera,' but had been brought young to Syracuse, and turned a potter's skill to the moulding of an empire.

Personally attractive, a typical soldier of fortune, he married a rich widow, raised a free company, tricked the Syracusans into accepting his help, as they had accepted that of Dionysius, established himself in their city by treachery and soon had Greek Sicily at his feet.

His power was a renewal of the challenge to Carthage, which was not politically affected by the conquests of Alexander or the disputes of his successors. She again threatened to overrun Sicily, and inflicted heavy defeat on Agathocles at Himera in 310; but he dared to counter the blow by himself invading Africa, where he won brilliant successes on Carthaginian soil. But his absence was the signal for revolt; in 307 he left his army in Africa to its fate and sped back to make peace with Carthage and recover his own despotism; an object which he accomplished by methods which have made his name a by-word. A domestic feud wrecked his plans for restoring the south Italian dominion of Dionysius. With his death in 289 at the age of seventy-two—tradition says that he was poisoned by his own grandson—ended the last attempt, except the adventure of Pyrrhus ten years later, to set up in Sicily a Hellenic power united enough to hold the Punic power at bay, or check its maritime ascendancy. But Agathocles had shown for the first time that Carthage was vulnerable in Africa itself.

#### Final Eclipse of Syracusan Power

ON the Italian mainland the Syracusan ascendancy melted away on the death of Dionysius I even more rapidly than in Sicily. The great tyrant had made use of the Lucanians and other Italians to bring the Greek cities under his sway; when he died the Italians combined and formed the Bruttian league against the divided Greeks, pressing them so hard that Tarentum appealed for aid against the barbarian to its mother city Sparta (343). Sparta responded; for in Greece, already dominated by Philip, there was no outlet for her military ambitions. King Archidamus headed an expedition, his troops being for the most part hired from Phocis whose brief hour of distinction

was over. The expedition failed, and the king was killed in battle with the Lucanians in 338, the year of Chaeronea.

Greece had no spare energies to expend on Magna Graecia; but in 334, when Alexander of Macedon was starting on the great eastern venture, his uncle Alexander 'the Molossian' of Epirus answered the call of the western Hellenes, perhaps with an imperial dream of his own which descended to his nephew Pyrrhus. His success was rapid, but in 330 his career was cut short by the dagger of an assassin before he could consolidate his power in Italy. When he fell he had already formed an alliance with the advancing Roman state whose foes in the south were also his foes; but he left no successor to carry on his projects—Pyrrhus was not yet born.

At the moment when the magistracies, the great administrative offices of the Roman state, ceased in 367 to be the monopoly of the old aristocracy (see Chap. 55) Rome was more powerful than any other single state. But the area of her supremacy was still limited to Latium and a portion of Etruria, and even within that area her domination was liable to be challenged. And now we find her faced by a new and formidable foe, whom perhaps we ought rather to call an old foe in a new guise, the Samnite confederacy. The leading feature in the advance of Rome during this period to an Italian supremacy is to be found in the series of Samnite wars beginning in 343 and ending in 290; with the honours divided as concerns the two principals, but a great concurrent increase in the power of Rome.

But before the struggle with the Samnites opened, the ascendancy which Rome had been able to establish after the great Gallic irruption was seriously threatened. It was perhaps only because the neighbours who feared her feared still



## ITALY AND SICILY IN THE HELLENISTIC AGE

Western Hellas stood aloof from Alexander's eastern adventures. Domestic feuds and conflict with Carthage prevented Syracuse from securing ascendancy in Sicily, and on the Italian mainland Rome, as yet dominant only in Latium, was drawn into conflict with the Samnites and Carthaginians.

more the Gallic menace from which they had already suffered so severely, that she was able to do something more than hold her own. There were, moreover, Latin cities which even allied with the Gauls against her, thereby forcing the rest of the Latins, however reluctantly, to throw themselves in effect under the protection of Rome, in spite of the subordination to her involved. The Latin League was renewed on terms more definitely emphasising the superior status of Rome (358), and the second Gallic tide was rolled back in 354. Etruscan cities seized the opportunity to attack Rome in the hour of her embarrassment; she suffered some defeats; but by 351 the Etruscans were forced to accept a peace for forty years.

In that year and the next the Gauls renewed hostilities for the third time, only to be decisively beaten by the son of the great Camillus who had beaten them

off forty years before. The Latins were held well in hand, and Etruria was bound to peace for many years to come.

At this stage, then, Carthage recognized Rome as the coming great power, and made with her the very important treaty of 348—in the view of some authorities, the first between the two states; while others regard it as a renewal with modifications of one which, according to Polybius (c. 150 B.C.), had been made in 509, the first year of the Republic.

In the supposed original treaty Carthage had undertaken to respect all Latin territory and coast towns as a Roman sphere of influence, and granted to Roman traders admission to the ports of Carthage itself, of Africa and Sardinia, and of the parts of Sicily which it then ruled; the Romans undertaking not to sail beyond the Fair Cape (C. Blanco), and to withdraw promptly if driven south of it by stress of weather, and recognizing the Carthaginian claim to regulate trade in the other districts mentioned.

#### Treaties between Rome and Carthage

THE second treaty was an adjustment of the situation in the west to political changes elsewhere. In general, it amplified the terms of the first, defining more precisely the limits of Roman seafaring, the use of Carthaginian harbours by Roman ships operating against third parties, and Carthaginian freedom of action in Italy; but it excluded Roman settlers from Sardinia and Africa, while admitting merchants to Carthage itself and its possessions in Sicily. Carthaginians were to have similar access to Rome.

To appreciate the inclusion of Tyre and Utica as well as Carthage in this treaty we must remember that after long loyalty to Persia since the days of Cyrus, and tolerance of growing misgovernment, the cities of Phoenicia had revolted openly in 351; that this revolt was part of what seemed at the moment to be a general break-up of the western half of the Persian Empire, which was only stayed by the ruthless efficiency of a new king, Artaxerxes III; and that in the suppression of the Phoenician revolt Persia had received Greek help.

Though Greeks are not mentioned, the effect of this treaty was to bind Rome, through commercial concessions, not to interfere with Carthaginian attacks on the Greek cities of the south; and a significant distinction was drawn between the protectorate of Rome and those cities which were merely allied with the Romans by treaty. In particular, if Carthaginians should sack a town in Latium which was not under Roman protection, though captives and loot might be taken away, the site was to revert to Rome; a lurid glimpse of what had been going on, out of reach of Dionysius' warships.

Five years after the conclusion of the treaty with Carthage, Rome was at war with the Samnites. For centuries the Sabellian highlanders of the Apennines had struggled to force their way into the plains between the hills and the Mediterranean; but Tuscans and Latins had held them in check, and for the past hundred years the direction of their expansion had been not on Latium but east and south-east. We have seen that they had begun to stream into Campania where they had been seduced from their old characteristic hardness, and the Campanians were now a soft folk, ill fitted to cope with their kinsmen of the hills. The most powerful group of the highlanders, the confederated Samnites, were now, in the middle of the fourth century, swarming down upon their degenerate precursors in Campania, as, farther east and south, Lucanians and Bruttians were pressing upon the degenerate Hellenic colonies; the semi-civilized were hammering the over-civilized. The Greeks were appealing to Hellas and were ere long to appeal to semi-Hellenic Epirus; the Campanians appealed to Rome, and Rome went to their rescue.

#### Beginning of the Samnite Wars

THE first Samnite war (343-341) was brief. It was marked by Roman victories in the field and by a mutiny on the part of the soldiery, which was suppressed by the sympathetic common sense of the distinguished dictator, Marcus Valerius Corvus, who as a youth had vanquished a Gallic Goliath in single combat. The war


was ended by a hasty peace, owing to the revolt of Rome's Latin allies ('socii') who resented their dependence on the dominant city.

In effect the Romans deserted the Campanians, in face of an immediate menace to their own position. They had forced the members of the Latin League into the Samnite war without consulting them. The Latins demanded only that they as a group should stand on an equality with Rome; she rejected the insolent proposal, and in two years' campaigning asserted her supremacy (340-338) in the Latin War, in which tradition recorded two picturesque episodes illustrative of the Roman character.

The consul Manlius Torquatus had won the torque or collar that gave him his name as a young man, by vanquishing a Gaulish champion in single combat, in accord with time-honoured custom. But as consul, for the sake of discipline, he issued an order that all such challenges were to be refused. Nevertheless his son, eager to prove himself worthy of his parent, ignored the order, fought a Latin champion, and slew him. Death was the penalty laid down for disobedience, and the father's unbending justice would yield to no prayers. His own son should not be spared, lest any man might say that another than the consul's son would have suffered the full penalty. By the father's order the son was doomed for his breach of discipline.

### Roman Consul's Roman Virtue

THE colleague of Manlius in the consulship was the plebeian Decius Mus. On the eve of a decisive battle both were warned in dreams that victory would fall to the army whose leader was slain on the field. When Decius saw that the wing he commanded was giving ground, he solemnly dedicated himself and the opposing army to the gods of the underworld, dashed headlong and alone into the ranks of enemy, and was slain. But 'behind



### SAMNITE WARRIORS' INDOMITABLE COURAGE

The stubbornness of the Samnites in their conflict with Rome is suggested in this mural painting from a Samnite grave at Capua. It depicts two Samnite warriors in tunics, greaves and helmets, engaged in gladiatorial combat and fighting on although one is pierced by a spear and both stream with blood.

*From Jahrbuch des deutschen archaol. Instituts*

him Rome's long battle came rolling on the foe,' and the victory was won.

The effect of the Latin War was to tighten Rome's grip upon Latium and to provide her with more lands upon which to settle her ever-increasing agricultural population. The Latin League was finally dissolved (338). Some of the cities were incorporated with Rome; others were admitted to the civil but not the political rights of Roman citizenship; all were at the military service of Rome; all were debarred from forming separate alliances or combinations in any shape with each other or with any external state.

The next few years witnessed the beginning and the end of the successes of the Epirote Alexander in southern Italy; and in 327-6 the Samnite confederacy directly challenged Rome to fight for the mastership of Italy, since their conflicting claims could be decided only by the arbitrament of arms.

The second Samnite war lasted twenty years; and it was not decisive. At first the Roman arms were so successful that in 321 the Samnites sued for peace; but the terms offered were so stringent that they were rejected and the war went on. In the same year the two consuls, leading an invading force into Samnium, were



trapped in a mountain pass known as the Caudine Forks where they could neither advance nor retire, and after a desperate struggle would have been annihilated if they had not submitted to the ignominious terms imposed by the Samnite victor Pontius. The troops were disarmed and compelled to pass 'under the yoke,' man by man, as a foe vanquished and disgraced, while the consuls pledged themselves to a treaty on the most favourable terms for the Samnites. But the Roman Senate refused to ratify the terms, and again the war went on.

#### Conclusion of the Samnite Wars

FOR six years, till 314, success seemed to flow with the Samnites; Campania was on the verge of deserting Rome. Then the tide turned. But the Roman victory was delayed by the intervention of the Etruscans in 311 when the forty years' peace reached its term. It was only postponed, however. After the first shock the Romans continuously defeated both their enemies. In 308 the Etruscans sued for peace, which was granted to their cities severally; and in 304 the Samnites obtained peace on terms probably severe but certainly not crushing.

For in 298 the Samnites renewed the war. Enemies were stirred up against Rome—Etruscans, Gauls, Umbrians, Sabines—on every side. But they lacked cohesion, and a shattering victory was won over their combined forces at Sentinum in Umbria in 295, when one of the consuls, the son of Decius Mus the hero of the Latin war, repeated his father's act of heroic devotion. Nevertheless, the stubborn Samnites fought on till a final defeat in 291 made further resistance hopeless, and in the following year peace was made on more favourable terms for the Samnites than Rome was wont to accord to any less dogged foe.

The Campanian cities, Italian or Greek, through which Rome had been involved in the Samnite wars, Capua and others, were now the allies of Rome, with variations in the degree of independence—never really complete—which they severally enjoyed; and Roman military colonies were settled in Campania as well as on

the eastern outskirts of Samnium at Luceria and Venusia (290).


Since the passing of the Licinian Law in 367, the old contest between the Orders had dwindled into nothing more than an occasional attempt on the part of a patrician faction either to evade the law or to recover some fraction of exclusive privilege by indirect methods. In effect the old charmed circle had become extended so as to include a number of plebeian families of influence, wealth or distinction, to whom office was in practice restricted hardly less rigidly than it had been by law to the purely patrician families of old. Technically, however, the disappearance of plebeian disabilities was now finally confirmed by the Hortensian Law (287), which recognized the Assembly of the plebs voting by tribes as a constitutional legislative body. The whole process is discussed in Chapter 55.

#### Menace to Rome from Southern Italy

MEANWHILE beyond the effective reach of Rome's arm, the Greek cities, since the death of Alexander of Epirus, had been suffering continuously from the pressure of Lucanians and Bruttians. In 302 Sparta made another effort to aid Tarentum; Tarentum, by a selfish disregard for the interests of her allies, strengthened her own position relatively, but lost the confidence of other Greeks. The Samnite wars brought them into a closer contact with Rome, to whose protection many of them were inclining to turn like their fellow-Greeks of Campania; while to Tarentum, which had entered upon a maritime treaty with Rome as early as 302, the new colonies at Venusia and Luceria seemed an intrusion menacing her own influence and commerce. The embroilment of Rome in the affairs of southern Italy could not long be postponed. From 285 to 282 she was engaged in a short and sharp war with the Gallic Boii and Senones in the north, which destroyed the latter and bridled the former for forty years to come; but even before that war was finished, she was drawn in to the southern complication. The story of the new conflict against Pyrrhus will be told in the next Chronicle.

# SYNCHRONISED TABLE OF DATES

B.C.	<i>Rome and the West</i>	<i>Greece and the East</i>	B.C.
		Death of the Thracian King Cotys.	360
		Persia: Artaxerxes III Ochus succeeds Artaxerxes II.	359
		Philip II usurps Macedonian crown.	357
357	Dionysius expelled from Syracuse.	Philip captures Amphipolis.	357
		Revolt of Athenian allies. The Social War.	
356	Five years' war between Rome and Etruscans begins.	Phocians seize Delphi. Sacred War begins.	356
		Philip takes Potidea. Birth of Alexander the Great.	356
354	Roman alliance with the Samnites.	End of Social War.	354
353	Hipparchus tyrant at Syracuse.		
351	Forty years' truce with Etruscans.	Persia: Revolt of Phoenicia and Cyprus.	351
350	Gallie war with Rome.	Philip takes Chalcidice. Athens and Olynthus allied.	349
348	Second (?) Treaty of Rome and Carthage.	Capture of Olynthus by Philip.	348
		First Athenian embassy to Philip.	347
		Death of Plato.	347
346	Dionysius returns to Syracuse.	Peace of Philocrates. Philip crushes the Phocians.	346
344	Timoleon arrives in Sicily. Battle of Hadranum.	Persia: Artaxerxes recovers Egypt.	345
	Archidamus of Sparta in South Italy.		
343	Dionysius finally leaves Syracuse.		
343-1	First Roman-Samnite War.	Conquest of Thrace by Philip.	343
341	Peace and alliance with Samnites.		
340	Beginning of the Great Latin War.	Naval reconstruction at Athens.	340
339	Timoleon defeats Carthaginians on the Crimæan.	Sacred War against Amphissa.	339
	Publian Laws confirm powers of Roman Plebs.		
338	Dissolution of the Latin League.	Chæronea. Congress of Corinth names Philip General.	338
	Death of Archidamus in Italy.	Persia: Death of Artaxerxes Ochus; Arses the usurper.	336
337	Death of Timoleon.	Assassination of Philip.	336
		Accession of Alexander, and of Darius III.	336
		Alexander destroys Thebes.	335
		Aristotle at Athens.	
334	Alexander the Molossian (of Epirus) in South Italy.	Alexander invades Persia: Battle of the Granicus.	334
		Battle of Issus; rout of Darius.	333
		Siege and capture of Tyre. Alexander in Egypt.	332
		Alexandria founded. Persian campaign renewed.	331
		Battle of Gaugamela (Oct.). Fall of Susa (Dec.).	331
		Alexander at Ecbatana (Mar.). Darius killed (June).	330
		Alexander conquers Arachosia.	329
329	Death of Alexander the Molossian.	Conquest of Bactria and Sogdiana.	328
		Alexander marries Roxana. The Chitral campaign.	327
327	Second or Great Samnite War begins (to 304).	Invasion of the Punjab and defeat of Porus.	326
		Capture of Multan. Voyage of Nearchus.	325
		Alexander at Ecbatana. Harpalus at Athens.	324
		Death of Alexander at Babylon (June).	323
		Greek revolt (Lamian War) against Antipater.	
		Lamian War ended by battle of Crannon.	322
		Deaths of Demosthenes and Aristotle.	
		India: Chandragupta (Sandracottus) expels the	
		Macedonians and founds Maurya empire.	
		Death of Perdicas. Antipater (Macedon) becomes	321
		Imperial Regent; Asia to Antigonus and Seleucus;	
		Egypt to Ptolemy Soter.	
321	Samnites trap Roman army at Caudine Forks.	Polysperchon succeeds Antipater as Regent.	318
	Rome renounces the capitulation; war rages doubt-	Cassander, son of Antipater, raises war against Poly-	317
	fully for seven years.	sperchon. Deaths of Phocion and Philip Archi-	
		dacus. Athens submits to Cassander.	
317	Agathocles tyrant of Syracuse.	Cassander takes Pnyx and kills Olympias.	316
		Coalition against Antigonus. Five years war.	315
		The Diadochi come to terms; war suspended.	311
		War renewed between Ptolemy and Antigonus.	310
314	Tide begins to set against Samnites.	Demetrius Poliorcetes, son of Antigonus, at Athens.	307
311	Etruscans join Samnites.	Demetrius defeats Ptolemy's fleet off Cyprus.	306
310	Agathocles, defeated in Sicily, invades Africa.	Epicurus and Zeno (Stoic) at Athens.	
	Romans defeat Etruscans at Lake Vadimo.	Demetrius attacks Rhodes.	305
309	Roman successes against Samnites and Etruscans.	India: Unsuccessful invasion by Seleucus.	
307	Agathocles returns to Sicily.	Antigonus killed at Battle of Ipsus.	301
306	Treaties of Rome with Carthage and Rhodes.	India: Embassy of Megasthenes to Chandragupta.	300
	Hernicans join the Samnites.		
305	Capture of Bovianum (Samnite capital).		
304	Samnites accept an honourable peace.		
299	Designs of Agathocles on S. Italy.	Bindusara succeeds Chandragupta.	298
298	Third Samnite (and Etruscan) War (to 290).	Death of Cassander.	297
		Independent kingdom of Bithynia (Ziplites).	
295	Roman victory at Sentinum.	Demetrius king of Macedon.	294
294	Samnite war; Etruscans withdraw.		
293	Defeat and death of the Samnite Pontius.		
290	Treaty of peace between Rome and Samnites.		
289	Rome aids Thurii against Lucanians.		
	Death of Agathocles.	Demetrius expelled from Macedon by Pyrrhus and	287
287	Hortensian Law at Rome finally confirms the legis-	Lysimachus, who then expels Pyrrhus.	
	lative powers of the Plebeian Assembly.	Demetrius gives himself up to Seleucus.	285
		Ptolemy II Philadelphus joint king of Egypt.	285
285	War with Gauls and Etruscans.	Deaths of Ptolemy I and Demetrius.	283
284	Roman disaster at Arretium.		
283	Roman victory over Boii at Lake Vadimo.		
282	Peace with Boii for forty-five years.		
	Breach between Rome and Tarentum.		
281	War declared with Tarentum, which calls in Pyrrhus.	Seleucus overthrows Lysimachus at Corupedium.	281
280	Pyrrhus in S. Italy.	Ptolemy Ceraunus murders Seleucus, and seizes the	280
		Macedonian crown. Antiochus I king of Syria.	
		Gauls invade Thrace. Death of Ptol. Ceraunus.	
		Achaean League inaugurated.	



#### EXTENT OF THE SUBJUGATED TERRITORIES THAT ALEXANDER ATTEMPTED TO WELD INTO AN EMPIRE

When we consider the difficulty of transporting an army in the fourth century B.C., Alexander's campaigns seem almost incredible. Here is traced the route by which he marched through Asia Minor and Syria to Egypt; thence to the centres of Persian power in Mesopotamia; and later through central Asia and over the Hindu Kush into India. When forced to retire, Alexander divided his forces into three contingents: one he led into Persia by way of the Gedrosian deserts; another, under the general Craterus, toiled through the Bolan Pass to meet him in Carmania; and the third, commanded by the admiral Nearchus, returned by sea, traversing the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf.

# ALEXANDER AS WORLD HERO: A STUDY

The Character and Achievements of a great Captain  
whose Feats of Arms moulded World History

By W. ROMAIN PATERSON

Author of *The Nemesis of Nations*

**P**LUTARCH in his *Life of Alexander* reminds us that he is not writing histories, but biographies, and that his main purpose is to reveal character and the signs of the inner life. And, indeed, after we have considered the career of Alexander the Great the question which haunts us is, How can such a man be explained? Whence came the restless, dynamic elements of mind and will? How much force of personality had he inherited from his father and his mother? It might have been expected that a youth who had Aristotle for his tutor would show signs of distinction, but we hardly look for military genius as the natural outcome of philosophy. And although during some four years the education of the future conqueror of the world was in the hands of the greatest philosopher of Greece, probably no man was more surprised than Aristotle by the achievements of his pupil. Alexander died at thirty-three, and his conquests had extended from the Aegean Sea to the Indus.

At the age of thirty-three Caesar was one day seen reading the *Life of Alexander*, and when he laid the book down he burst into tears. Asked to explain the cause of his emotion, he replied that, whereas at the age of thirty-three Alexander had achieved everything, he himself had as yet done nothing. Napoleon, who was likewise haunted by the fame of Alexander, said to Bourrienne in 1798: 'This small Europe is too paltry a field. Great fame can be won only in the East.' At the age of twenty-four Napoleon was still an artillery commander, but at the same age Alexander had already won the battle of the Granicus and the battle

of Issus, which decided in their main lines the future relations between Europe and Asia. Napoleon used to express contempt for conquests won merely 'dans cette vieille Europe.' Nevertheless, on reviewing his own victories within an area which he considered too restricted for his ambition, he said: 'I look upon myself as perhaps the most daring of all commanders in war.'

Now, it may seem unreasonable to compare the simpler methods of ancient warfare with the far more complicated problems which face a modern commander. But amid the changing technique of war the human factor remains constant, the principles of strategy remain the same. The tactics of Cromwell are still carefully studied in military colleges, although modern **Superb generalship** equipment has out-  
**of Alexander**stripped the material at Cromwell's disposal. In at least one of his battles in Asia the tactics of Alexander resembled those of Napoleon at Austerlitz. In mere daring and in their large design, Alexander's campaigns seem to be rivalled only by the campaigns of Hannibal. He never lost a battle, and he never retreated in face of the enemy. If we consider the range of his operations no general of the ancient world, not even Caesar, and none of the modern world, not even Napoleon, can be compared with him. All other commanders drew plans on a smaller scale. While they played with fragments of continents, he played with continents. Moreover, it was while still in adolescence that, like the Prometheus of western civilization, he carried its light far into the Orient.

Character has its origins, and therefore Plutarch wisely allows us a glimpse of Alexander's mother, Olympias, whose father was king of Epirus in northern Greece. She had passed on to her son her romantic temperament, her religious mysticism and her gift of imagination. She was a devotee of the Dionysian cult, shared the excitements of Orphism, and may actually have been one of those Bacchantes so vividly depicted in the *Bacchae* of Euripides. Highly strung and intolerant of a rival, she appears to have awakened a warm affection in her son. When Alexander was in Asia he received from Antipater, whom he had left as regent in Macedon, a letter complaining that Olympias was interfering in affairs of state. But Alexander re-

marked that a man like Antipater did not know that one tear of a mother can obliterate ten thousand letters. In the domestic crisis which ensued when King Philip of Macedon was unfaithful to Olympias, and installed in the palace at Pella a certain Cleopatra, a Macedonian princess by whom he had a son, Alexander quarrelled with his father and took Olympias away. It was from her that he had received his sense of humour, his unconventionality, but also his impatient and impetuous nature. We are able to trace this impulsiveness both in the conduct of his campaigns and in his social relations. It was responsible for some of his most brilliant actions in the field, as well as for certain errors committed in resentment of disloyalty.

At the battle of the Granicus, for example, he refused to accept the advice of the cautious old Chief of Staff, Parmenio, who with many plausible reasons advocated delay. Alexander attacked at once, and won his first victory over the Persians, which opened the way into Asia and made possible the final overthrow of Darius. But once in a burst of anger after a banquet at Samarkand, at which too much wine had been drunk, he slew with his own hand, not indeed without terrible provocation at first patiently borne, his friend and companion Clitus, who had saved the King's life at that same battle of the Granicus. We shall be disappointed if we expect to find undeviating consistency in a character like Alexander's, and Plutarch, as well as Arrian and Quintus Curtius, prepares us for the most glaring contradictions in a being who appears to have been as highly developed on the emotional as on the intellectual side. We are therefore not surprised to learn that after he had slain his friend he was plunged in remorse, seized the spear from the corpse, and was



#### SYMPATHY BETWEEN MOTHER AND SON

His soaring imagination and idealism, his impetuosity and liability to fits of frenzy, Alexander seems to have inherited from his mother, Olympias. The respect in which he held her and their mutual affection are commemorated by their juxtaposition in this cameo executed long after both were dead.

*From Bernoulli, 'Darstellungen Alexanders des Grossen.'*

about to turn it upon himself when he was disarmed by his bodyguard.

Born in the autumn of 356 B.C., he was brought up at a court seething with political ambition, because it was during the reign of Philip that Macedon gained the headship of Hellas by a policy of alternate boldness and caution. Philip was not only a capable military leader but a statesman and shrewd diplomatist, and it was a grave error on the part of Demosthenes to underrate his powers and to taunt him with being 'not even a respectable barbarian.' While cultured Athens was listening to her orators, Philip, in the rude north of Greece, was perfecting a military system which made him master of the Greek states and his son master of the world. It was from Philip that Alexander inherited his pertinacity, his long views, his faculty of decision and his military instinct. Without the military machine which Philip had created Alexander could never have started on his invasion of the Persian empire, or at least he could not have started so soon. And yet, in spite of an astute and calculating mind, Philip, like Olympias, betrayed certain histrionic traits which were also shown now and again in the actions of their son.

Philip prided himself 'like a sophist' on his oratorical gifts, and he caused to be engraved on the coins of the realm the scene of his chariots coming in victorious at the Olympic games. Alexander was once asked whether he, too, had not a desire to compete in the races, and he replied, with perhaps a precocious political significance, 'Yes, provided I have kings as rivals.' He apparently had no undue enthusiasm for sport, although he was a sportsman, but he had chosen winning-posts of another kind. Certain Persian ambassadors who came to Pella, the Macedonian capital, predicted that 'the notorious cleverness' of the father would be eclipsed by the genius of the son.

As a youth Alexander chafed in vexation in case Philip might by his many conquests leave nothing else to be conquered. But the throne became vacant soon enough. It was while Philip was in the act of creating a compromise in the family quarrel

that he was struck down by an assassin, and although Alexander had taken his mother's part in the feud he quickly avenged his father's murder. It was to the dead king's credit that he had early perceived the exceptional gifts of Alexander, in whose education he seems to have taken the liveliest interest. It was he who had first noticed that Alexander 'was far from pliable,' that his character was forceful, but that it would respond to wise teaching, and it was for that reason that he summoned Aristotle to undertake the final shaping of his mind. But the world of action as well as of thought was to be his university, and he would be found devising new undertakings when death surprised him at Babylon.

It was Aristotle who interested him in the study of nature and of medicine. But Alexander was also a lover of books, and was a fervent admirer of the Homeric poems. Once when in the heart of Asia he

Alexander's culture  
and character

sent to Greece for books, and the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides together with other works were dispatched to him. Unlike Napoleon, who abhorred long and elaborate meals, Alexander lingered at the banquet, not, indeed, as Plutarch is careful to remind us, for the sake of the pleasures of the table, but for the sake of table-talk on history, poetry and religion and in order to take part in the combat of wit and repartee.

Character is frequently foreshadowed by some casual act in early youth, and perhaps the twin nature of Alexander's mind—its audacity and its caution—is best prefigured in the possibly apochryphal story of the taming of the famous horse Bucephalus. The animal, of Thessalian breed, was offered to king Philip for a large sum. The horse was to be put through his paces on a level stretch of ground, but would allow no one to mount him, and appeared to be so unmanageable and fiery that Philip ordered him to be taken away. Alexander, however, who was then a mere stripling, noticed that the horse was rearing and plunging owing to its own shadow falling in front, and he exclaimed that a fine horse was going to be lost because the grooms



#### IDEALIST AND MAN OF ACTION

Possessed of an imagination that knew no limits, Alexander had also great intellectual power, a genius for practical affairs and the gift of command—a complex nature suggested in this portrait, usually considered reliable.

*The Louvre; photo, Alinari*

and officers did not know how to manoeuvre it. The king reprimanded his son for impudence, and asked him if he actually supposed himself more capable than older and more experienced men. Alexander practically said 'Yes,' and offered a wager, the price of the animal, if he failed. Amid the laughter of all present he took the bridle rein, and after he had turned the horse towards the sun so that there was now no shadow dancing before it, he patted and quietened it. Then he mounted and, holding the reins without pulling at the mouth, he soon had it in hand, and cantered up and down to the great delight of the king, who exclaimed: 'Get a kingdom fit for you, because Macedon isn't big enough.' Bucephalus, or 'bull head'—probably so called because

of the width between the eyes—helped to win that larger kingdom, because Alexander rode him in all his campaigns. The horse, for which he had a great affection, died of old age in India, and Alexander founded a city which he called Bucephalia, and which has been identified as the modern Jalapur.

If the character of a born leader of men is made up of dynamic as well as of static elements, that is to say, if it must contain forces of energy as well as forces of control, then Alexander was fully equipped for what was, after all, the greatest achievement by any single human will in history. His early manhood revealed both vehemence and self-command, and it revealed magnanimity. We are told that he had a perfect mastery over his appetite. Neither wine nor sleep nor passion nor the theatre came between him and his ambition. He treated female prisoners 'as if they had been statues,' and there is no reason to disbelieve the account of his chivalrous and romantic behaviour to the wife and the daughters of Darius. When the queen of Caria sent him viands and delicacies and offered him her own cooks, he replied that in youth he had been taught to do without cooks and that for breakfast he had a night march and instead of supper a light breakfast. It reminds us of Napoleon's description of his habits in a letter to his mother in 1788—'I go to bed at ten, I rise at four, I eat only once a day, at three o'clock.'

Alexander's endurance of hardship reminds us also of Caesar's self-discipline; for Caesar 'never made his feeble health an excuse for precedent to Command soft ways of life, but on the contrary his military service a cure for his feeble health,' according to Plutarch in his *Life of Caesar*. By simple diet and by frequently sleeping in the open air and by enduring discomfort Caesar kept his body strong. Alexander appears to have had a far more powerful frame than either Caesar or Napoleon. If, unlike either of those two, he sometimes slept a deep sleep before a battle—as, for instance, before the great battle of Gaugamela, popularly known as Arbela, it was

because he was sure of his plan of attack and of the hour for launching it.

He had shared the severe military discipline of his father's army in the rough land of Macedon. As a boy he had known the life of the camp. At the age of sixteen in the year 340 B.C. he was left in charge of the seal of state while Philip was besieging Byzantium.

Eager to have something to his own credit on his father's return, Alexander meanwhile began a small war on his own account, and subdued a neighbouring tribe. He seized their town, and, in anticipation of a curious vanity which would follow him throughout his career, he renamed the town after himself as if foreshadowing that greater Alexandria which he founded in Egypt. In 338 B.C. he fought under his father's eye at Chaeronea where Philip's victory made him at last Hegemon or supreme War Lord of Greece, which he had promised to lead against the common enemy, Persia. But that was to be the task of Alexander, who in the summer of 336 B.C. became king of Macedon.

We should be committing a grave error if we accepted the views of earlier historians such as Niebuhr and Grote, who explained the career of Alexander only as the result of the egoism and megalomania of a conqueror. He had certainly ambition in abundance, and was early conscious of extraordinary powers. In the *Mémoires de Sainte Hélène* Napoleon says that it was not till after Lodi (May 10, 1796) that he felt the first stirrings of 'high ambition.' But Alexander was the son of a king, and an immense task had been bequeathed to him. His father must often have talked to him about the necessity of preventing another Persian invasion and of the coming struggle in which either Greece or Persia must be broken in pieces. As

a boy Alexander had heard of the sufferings endured by the Greeks of the preceding century. When he was leading his soldiers against Darius he reminded them, on the eve of the battle of Issus, that when Xerxes, the son of a greater Darius, was in Hellas, temples were desecrated and wells polluted. He had listened to tales of Marathon, Salamis and of Thermopylae.

He felt he had a mission which, moreover, he had inherited. The taunt of Demosthenes that the people of Macedon were not Greeks at all was ethnologically baseless. The ruder northern kinsfolk were naturally the butt of the Athenians, and in one of his plays Aristophanes introduces a god of the Triballi (a tribe, by the way, which Alexander subdued), who is incapable of speaking a word of intelligible Greek. But the people of Macedon shared Greek blood and had remained closer to the primitive stock. In the fifth century the dynasty had proved itself of Argive descent, and a predecessor of




ALEXANDER AS GOD AND HERO

After his death divine honours were paid to Alexander, and images of him commonly appear on monuments and coins. Thus we see him above as Heracles, wearing a lion's skin for helmet; as Amun, with a sheep's horns protruding from his curly hair; and as an heroic type, the ideal warrior.

*British Museum and Alexander sarcophagus, Constantinople Museum*





# IDEALISED FIGURES THAT ATTRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER THE BEAUTY AND INVINCIBLE MAJESTY OF A GOD

It is more difficult to realize the physical characteristics of Alexander than to understand his mind, since in art he is usually given the perfect form of a Praxitelean god—as in these two nude figures. Plutarch states that Alexander had the body of an Olympic athlete, and other evidence testifies to his grace. But his head was bent towards his left shoulder, and this deformity has here been overlooked. In the Rodanini statue (left) he has the aspect of a divine hero, and the statuette in which he is also shown naked seems to identify him with Zeus, cloaked (right, statuette), he might be a personification of majesty.

*Glyptothek, Munich; photos, Buckmann; right, British Museum*

Alexander who bore the same name was called the Philhellene because he had taken the side of Greece against the Persians. Alexander belonged to the white-skinned, fair-haired race which, for want of a better word, we may still call Aryan. Plutarch points out that the painter Apelles made his complexion too dark, because actually he was 'fair and ruddy.' As a Greek by birth as well as by education he was determined to carry out the task of which the divided Greek states were incapable. The key to the meaning of his career lies in the single word, Persia.

Alexander was at the head of an extraordinarily well organized military power. The Macedonian phalanx, which had been perfected by Philip, was the most formidable infantry of the day. The men were equipped with a pike eighteen feet long, which was called the sarissa. There were some six battalions in close formation. As in the Spartan phalanx, the ranks were eight deep so that when the pikes were carried at the level those of the rear rank almost reached to the front rank. In shock tactics the phalanx was rarely unsuccessful. It formed the centre, but cavalry action and the tactical use of light-armed foot soldiers who carried swords and shields prepared the way for its advance. There were also bodies of bowmen. The cavalry, of

which there were numerous squadrons, were equipped with metal helmet, cuirass, sword and a lance six feet in length. The light horsemen were armed with still longer lances. As the force moved out to battle the cavalry were placed on the wings, and Alexander invariably led the right wing while Parmenio, the Chief of Staff, commanded on the left. According to Arrian the army was slightly more than 30,000 infantry strong, with some 5,000 cavalry. It was designed much on the lines of a British Expeditionary Force for colonial warfare, mobile and unhampered by too many stores.

If we consider the prestige of Persia, the extent of the empire, its resources in men, money and material, the adventure of Alexander must have appeared almost insane to those who watched him setting out for the Dardanelles in the spring of 344 B.C. He was taking a tremendous risk in leaving Europe at all, even although the Greek states had been overawed by his sudden display of power. There was always the danger of an insurrection in his rear. Besides, Persia held the sea, her fleet was under the command of an able Greek sailor, Memnon of Rhodes, and she had naval bases in the Mediterranean and the Aegean. Persian money in the form



#### FEATURES THAT WERE WELL KNOWN FROM MACEDON TO INDIA

With all that was noble in Alexander's character were mingled elements of coarseness and weakness—as is indicated in the portrait bust from Alexandria seen above (left, full face and profile). It presents a man of power and determination, inspired by supreme self-confidence and ruthless energy, but his loose-lipped mouth and fleshy chin suggest sensuality and imperfect self-control. This individuality is lacking in idealised portraits of Alexander, such as the third head, weakly pretty.

*British Museum and Boston Museum of Fine Arts.*

of bribes might find and actually did find its way into the hands of prominent Greek statesmen like Demosthenes, who remained Alexander's most bitter political enemy. The young king had made Macedon a spring-board for a leap into the unknown.

Nevertheless, the longer we follow his campaigns the more we see the strategic genius which inspired them. His scientific grasp of the problems which awaited him seemed to work in harmony with his strong love for romantic adventure. It was characteristic of the son of Olympias to visit the site of Troy and to worship at the tomb of Achilles, whom he claimed as




**CHIEF STAFF OFFICER**

An old general who had won a great reputation under Philip, Parmenio was Alexander's trusted Chief of Staff and in battle commanded the left wing.

*From the Alexander sarcophagus*

ancestor. And it was only after all due rites had been paid that he had crossed the Hellespont. News of his advance had reached the Persian satraps in Asia Minor, and they assembled a large army to meet him at the Granicus, a river of the Troad which flows into the Sea of Marmora. He was thus fighting at the gates of Asia. On that day he did not ride Bucephalus, but another horse which was killed under him.

The depth and current of the river dismayed some of his officers, and, as we have already mentioned, Parmenio advised delay in forcing the crossing because the Persians, assisted by Greek mer-



**SPLENDID TOMB WHOSE CARVINGS CONSTITUTE AN HISTORICAL RECORD**

Not only people of his own race, but aliens also paid tribute to the military genius of Alexander. He is represented in the hunting field (see folder facing page 1434), and leading his troops to victory over the Persians in the reliefs decorating this great sarcophagus found at Sidon (now at Constantinople) constructed to contain the remains of a Sidonian ruler. Since the carved figures were executed shortly after Alexander's death (323 B.C.), their historical value is obvious.

*From Hensley Bay & Reinach, 'Une nécropole royale à Sidon'*

enary troops, held a strong position on the opposite bank. But Alexander at the head of thirteen troops of horse was already across, and he was followed by the infantry, fighting to gain a solid footing in the ford. The struggle appears to have taken place partly on land and partly in the water until the Macedonian infantry gradually drove the enemy from the eastern bank. Alexander had a narrow escape when attacked by two prominent Persian commanders, for he was conspicuous in his glittering helmet, buckler and white plumes. He was saved by Clitus, 'the very man,' adds Arrian 'who was killed by Alexander in a fit of anger six years later.'

The Macedonian cavalry, using their shock tactics, broke through the enemy line, and then came the opportunity of the phalanx, which in this first battle in Asia revealed itself to the Persians as the

most formidable instrument of assault which they had hitherto met. It appears that the Persian reserves posted on higher ground had not been utilised. These were Greek professional soldiers who

**Battle of  
the Granicus**

had been traitors to the cause of Greece, and when the phalanx came up to them Alexander ordered that no quarter was to be given. There is evidence in Arrian that Alexander in the battle of the Granicus revealed himself as a great cavalry leader. He had quickly noticed that the Persian cavalry had been placed on the defensive. This was a tactical error of which Alexander immediately took advantage. A feint attack on the Persian left was designed to cause a breach in their centre, and the movement succeeded. When the phalanx came into action the enemy centre was already weakened, while a counter attack by the Persian cavalry in 'wedge shape' failed.

It is impossible to check the account of losses in ancient battles. There are dis-



#### RIVALS FOR ASCENDANCY IN ASIA

The most effective force in Alexander's army was the heavy infantry, but he had also a formidable mounted contingent: above a typical Macedonian footman and cavalryman (top left and right respectively). They appear to have been more heavily armed than their linen-swathed Persian foes (below).

*From Alexander sarcophagus, Constantinople Museum*

crepancies in the authorities. According to Diodorus over ten thousand of the Persian infantry and two thousand of their cavalry were killed, and there were thousands of prisoners. Owing to the annihilation of the Greek mercenaries in the service of Darius the losses of the enemy were undoubtedly high. The Macedonian casualties were on a far smaller scale, and, like Wellington, Alexander was careful of the lives of his men. He never would have said what, in a moment of criminal arrogance, Napoleon said to Metternich: 'A man such as I am cares little for the lives of a million men.' On the contrary, Alexander could not at this early stage afford to throw away a single soldier. Evidence of his warm and essentially chivalrous nature may be gathered from the fact that he ordered the great sculptor Lysippus to make statues of the twenty-five knights of the royal bodyguard who fell in the action.

What is certain is that the victory of the Granicus was of decisive importance,



**SHOCK OF MACEDONIAN CHARGE THROWS THE PERSIANS INTO CONFUSION—**

Alexander first met the armies of Persia on the banks of the River Granicus early in 334; the battle—primarily a cavalry engagement—ended in a decisive victory for the Macedonians. It is believed to be this conflict which is represented on one side of the Alexander sarcophagus: the panel shown in this and the opposite page is actually consecutive. At the extreme left (upper strip) Alexander, who wears the lion's skin of Heracles, is seen engaging a Persian cavalryman.

*From Handy Boy & Beinach—*



—IN THE FIERCE HAND-TO-HAND FIGHTING AT THE BATTLE OF THE GRANICUS

The chivalry of Persia has been disorganized by the Macedonian horse and the infantry has joined battle. A hoplite is conspicuous because of the heaviness of his body armour, since none is worn by any of the Persians—not even by the officer who has been mortally wounded by the Macedonian marshal Parmenio (extreme right, lower strip). The Persian archers seem to have played a prominent part in the battle, since two are here represented, both very like modern Arabs.

—'Une métropole royale à Sôdon'

because as a result many of the coast towns of Asia Minor submitted. The Persian prestige was already shaken. The conquest of Miletus came later (334 B.C.), but Sardis surrendered. In the elation of success and eager to convince the Greeks and especially the Athenians that their chosen leader had already done good work for them, Alexander sent as a gift to Athens three hundred of the captured shields besides other

Alexander's politico  
gift to Athens

spoils, with the following inscription: 'Alexander, the son of Philip,

and all the Greeks except the Spartans [took these spoils] from the Barbarians who dwell in Asia.' The gift was as shrewd as it was generous, since it might at last persuade the hostile states that they had been misled by their statesmen in their hatred of Macedon, who was now proving herself worthy to lead Greece in the conflict with the East.

The inscription contains a great deal of subtlety which we might easily lose sight of unless we remembered the relations which had existed between Macedon and the rest of Hellas. Alexander proudly announces himself as 'the son of Philip,' the king to whom Demosthenes had often in his orations to the Athenians referred with scorn. In the second place, Alexander makes a characteristic thrust at

Sparta who had sullenly refused to recognize the headship of the king of Macedon. And in the third place, by his application of the word 'barbarians,' which originally meant 'foreigners,' to the Persians, he seems ironically as well as delicately to reprove the rest of Hellas for having so often used the word against the Macedonians. Such was his first bulletin of victory. 'But,' writes Plutarch, 'whatever he took from the Persians in the form of drinking cups and purple fabrics, he sent with a few exceptions to his mother.'

Alexander soon revealed that he was a statesman as well as a soldier. By the bold policy of conferring liberal institutions on the cities which opened their gates to him, he created allies at every stage of his progress. This civic plan was of particular importance in the case of the coast towns suffering under the rule of tyrants and oligarchies, and the forced maintenance of Persian garrisons. Alexander's fleet was at this stage weak compared with that of Persia, and, against the views of some of his officers, he decided to avoid a naval engagement.

It was now that he began to link up his strategy on land with his strategy on the sea, and at first he used his fleet, consisting of some 160 vessels, for defensive purposes, as in the case of Miletus, where his ships were in occupation of the



STIRRING EXPLOITS IN WAR AND THE CHASE COMMEMORATED

All the reliefs on the royal sarcophagus at Sidon are treated in a vividly naturalistic manner, violent action being expressed with consummate skill. Convention is not absent from this panel, since the Macedonian soldiers are represented naked, but this does not detract from its essential realism. The vigour with which the lightly armed Persians attack the formidable Macedonian infantry illustrates the quality of the men composing the armies that Alexander overcame.

*From Hamdy Boy at Reimsch, 'Une nécropole royale à Sidon.'*








harbour. Since the Persian fleet was far more powerful, the impulsive victor of the Granicus was capable of employing Fabian tactics where they were necessary for success. Persia had in her service all the ships of Phoenicia and Cyprus, and the seamen were tried veterans. A far deeper and larger plan of campaign had formed itself in Alexander's mind, and he was determined not to jeopardise it by risking a naval battle in which the odds would be against him. He was content, therefore, to lay siege to Miletus, which finally succumbed. It was known that the Persian admiral was about to attack the Greek islands as well as the sea ports on the mainland for the purpose of creating a revolution which would have compelled Alexander to abandon his enterprise against Asia. But, by one of those strokes of the good fortune which followed him, the Persian design was frustrated by the death of Memnon. Alexander was able to continue his land campaign through Paphlagonia and Cappadocia into Cilicia, now known as the vilayet of Adana, where he and Darius at last met at Issus. It was Alexander's second year in Asia Minor and the results of the battle were momentous.

Plutarch, with one of those subtle touches which bring before us the state of mind of the men about whom he writes,

says that Darius had been dreaming about the Macedonian phalanx. He had

doubtless heard of its prowess at the battle of the Granicus, at which he had not been present, and he was aware that his own infantry was inferior to Alexander's. Nevertheless, Darius had moved from Susa, and had passed through the Amanian gate into the plain of Issus, which skirts the shores of the Gulf of Alexandretta. A Macedonian outlaw who had taken refuge at the Persian court had warned the monarch not to choose his battlefield within the narrow passes of the mountains, but to await the army of Macedon on ground on which it could be easily encircled by the vast Persian hordes. But Darius broke camp and marched against Alexander, who had passed into Syria through the Cilician gates before Darius



TACTICS SUCCESSFUL AT ISSUS

Alexander's battle line was arranged on the plan tried at the Granicus—cavalry on either wing and the heavy infantry in the centre. The right wing was flung on the Persians, shattering their left and outflanking their centre.

could overtake him. For Alexander's plan was first to seize the Syrian coast and especially Tyre as a naval base from which to begin the war on sea.

It is generally supposed that the two armies missed each other; indeed, according to Plutarch, they passed each other in the night. This is scarcely credible. The probability is that so astute a commander as the king of Macedon had left a rear-guard in order to keep him informed of the enemy's movements. Instead of the battlefield of Issus having been 'a present made by Fortune to Alexander,' as Plutarch says, it is far more likely that it was of his own choosing. He had noticed that the plain of Issus would afford too little space for the alinement of the vast Persian host. Owing to alluvial deposit by the streams which flow down from the encircling hills the plain is now almost five miles in width, but in the days of Darius and Alexander it was less than two.

It suited Alexander's strategy, therefore, to allow Darius to believe that the small army from Europe was fleeing before him into Syria. We know that Darius

supposed that Alexander's delay in Cilicia was caused by fear, whereas it was caused by a severe chill which Alexander had contracted by having bathed in the cold waters of the river Cydnus. Darius, as we have seen, had informers in his camp, and it is almost certain that there were also informers in the camp of Alexander. What more natural, therefore, than that he should make use of information conveyed to him by Persian deserters and allow Darius to be entangled in the plain of Issus with the sea in front and the narrow defiles of the mountain range

behind. The situation had, indeed, its perils for the Macedonian army, because Darius barred the way back to Europe, and if Alexander were beaten his line of retreat would lie through Syria, which was under Persian rule. It was for that reason that Alexander hazarded an engagement on ground least suitable to the enemy but favourable to himself. As soon as he had heard that Darius had reached the plain he turned to fight his second battle with the Persians. News had arrived in Greece that Darius in person was leading some six hundred



#### ALEXANDER ATTACKS THE PERSIAN STAFF WITH HIS HEAVY CAVALRY—

The army with which Darius faced Alexander on the plain of Issus was of formidable size, and was disposed with skill. A large force of Greek mercenaries was grouped in the centre, to counter the Macedonian phalanx, and on the right wing was an overwhelming detachment of horse. Alexander's tactical genius, however, won the day. With his heavy cavalry he drove back the Persian left and charged the mercenaries in their exposed flank, thus enabling the phalanx to advance successfully.

*National Museum, Naples—*

thousand men against the son of Philip, and Demosthenes predicted that Alexander would be 'trampled under the hoofs of the Persian cavalry.'

As he emerged into the wider part of the plain Alexander began to deploy his forces until they occupied a line stretching from the hills to the shore. As usual he led the right wing while Parmenio on the left had orders to hug the shore in view of a possible outflanking movement on the part of the Persians. Spies had no doubt informed Darius that it was Parmenio who was in command on the left.

It may have been for this reason that the best Persian cavalry was massed on the Persian right with a view to overwhelming him. Alexander, however, having observed the manoeuvre, quickly transferred his Thessalian horsemen to the left to support Parmenio, who was no doubt already known to Darius to be a less daring leader than Alexander. Aware of the dangerous situation in which his army had been caught, the Persian king was anxious to extricate himself. It was too late. It would be impossible without disaster to attempt to retreat through the mountain



—IN AN IRRESISTIBLE ADVANCE THAT GAVE THE MACEDONIANS VICTORY

It was with the intention of capturing Darius, who had stationed himself on the right of the Persian centre, that Alexander cut his way into the enemy ranks. But in the confusion occasioned among the Persians by the success of the manoeuvre Darius was able to escape. This mosaic panel of the third century a.d., from Pompeii, shows Alexander (left page) charging the chariot in which is Darius (above); it is improbable, however, that the two monarchs actually thus encountered each other.

—Photo, Alinari

defiles into Assyria again. The army of Macedon, with its Greek contingents, was already advancing.

Its phalanx formed the centre, and once more Darius had prepared a counterstroke. His own centre was held by some thirty thousand Greek mercenaries, to whom was allotted the invidious task of fighting men of their own race. It was a case of Greek meeting Greek, and it was at the battle of Issus that the Macedonian phalanx came through its sternest ordeal. In the words of Quintus Curtius the phalanx was 'haud dubio robur exercitus,' which we may translate as 'the nerve



**FUTILE KING OF KINGS**

At Issus, Darius III of Persia fled from the field when defeat was imminent, as he was later to flee from Gaugamela knowing his empire lost.

*From Alexander mosaic*

of the army.' As at the battle of the Granicus, a river, the Pinarus, lay between the opposed forces. Before the engagement Darius had thrown a screen of cavalry and infantry across the river to mask his dispositions, but those troops were withdrawn before the battle began. Almost in a Napoleonic manner Alexander had encouraged his men with the hope of plunder, and in a speech attributed to him by Quintus Curtius he told them that the booty of the East would be theirs while he also reminded them of the victories which they had already won.

The development of the action is clearly seen in the pages of Arrian, who shows that Alexander gave the enemy no chance of outflanking him. He was in the forefront of the battle, and it was his own brilliant handling of his cavalry on the Persian left which made it possible to attack the Greek mercenaries on the flank and prepare the way for a mass movement by the phalanx against the enemy centre. An attempt to outflank the Macedonian right had been foiled, and for some time the left was also in danger owing to the numerical superiority of the Persian cavalry who carried out charge after charge. Moreover, the phalanx, after having reached the opposite bank, was held in check by the enemy, who occupied higher ground. The Persian left, however was

already shattered, and the centre broke owing to a combined attack by Alexander's cavalry, which he was personally leading, and by the phalanx.

It was the aim of Alexander to seize the person of the Persian king, who was seen standing in his chariot surrounded by his bodyguard. The horses, infuriated by spear wounds and by the din and clash of the fight, were rearing and plunging. In case the chariot might be overturned, Darius leapt from it, and mounted a horse which, as Curtius informs us, was kept ready for the purpose. Night was coming down, and Darius escaped.

As long as the light lasted the pursuit continued. The broken army was streaming away eastwards again. We hear of immense Persian losses, whereas Alexander had used his far smaller force with such skill and economy that it was described as a great victory at

**Results of the Battle of Issus**

a trifling cost. In any case, the battle of Issus meant that the Persian monarchy could no longer hope to convert Europe into an Asiatic province. Alexander had won a victory for posterity. The family of the Persian king fell into the hands of the victor, who treated them with chivalry. When Alexander inspected the luxurious pavilion of Darius, with its costly furniture, its gold and silver basins, Persian carpets, and rich, perfumed fabrics, he exclaimed, no doubt ironically: 'It seems that this is how to be a king!'

Why did not Alexander immediately follow up his victory, advance to the Euphrates and destroy the Persian Empire which he had so seriously shaken? The correct answer to that question reveals the large plan which he had conceived. Instead of crossing over the mountains into Assyria, he began the conquest of Phoenicia, spent seven months in the siege of Tyre, and then passed to Egypt, where he founded Alexandria. It was from Egypt that Napoleon hoped to

follow in the tracks of Alexander in order to overthrow the British Empire in India. But whereas Napoleon's Syrian campaign did not lead him eastwards at all, the Syrian and Egyptian campaigns of Alexander were only the beginning of a far vaster itinerary. As we have seen, the meaning of his anabasis lies in the word Persia. His eyes, like Napoleon's, were always on the East,


**Egypt a base** but he could not advance **against Persia** into Asia and leave in his rear a great tract of territory under Persian domination. By her presence in Phoenicia and in Egypt, by her hold on Cyprus and especially on Tyre, Persia was still all-powerful on the Mediterranean seaboard. Besides, those lands and islands were a recruiting ground for soldiers, sailors and slaves. For military as well as for commercial reasons it was necessary to destroy her influence once and for all in the Mediterranean basin.

Alexander had temporarily disbanded his fleet, but we now get a glimpse of his sense of sea power. Napoleon said that he would 'conquer the sea by the land.' He failed, and the achievement is rare in history, but it was the achievement of Alexander. With extraordinary insight he saw that at least in his own case the conquest, by operations on land, of the Syrian coast would give naval supremacy. He seized the Phoenician ports, and the Phoenician ships in the service of Persia deserted to his colours. Ultimately the whole Phoenician fleet passed under his control, and Cyprus alone sent him a hundred ships. Tyre, whose wealth and fascination are vividly painted in the pages of Isaiah and of Ezekiel, was one of Alexander's greatest prizes, although its capture involved much patient labour of engineering and siege work. A mole was built from the mainland in order that the fortress might be carried by assault. Arrian says that eight thousand Tyrians fell. Tyre, 'the island of the princes of the sea,' had now passed into the power of

the audacious northern king. The wealth of the world was falling into his hands. Ancient civilizations were bowing before him. When he reached Egypt, groaning under Persian satraps, he was received with acclamation as a liberator, and when he left it Alexandria became his monument.

It is worth pausing to notice that at the height and in the intoxication of military and material success he was still haunted by the supernatural. It was while he was in Egypt that he visited the oasis of Siwa in order to question the oracle of Amen, whom, as Ammon, the Greeks identified with Zeus. We must not, indeed, read too refined a spiritual meaning into Alexander's religious pilgrimages, which had doubtless a political motive. When the priest hailed him as a 'son of the god,' and in doing so made a grammatical blunder, Alexander was content with the omen, and used it to increase his prestige with the multitude. Napoleon said that Alexander, by having had himself declared 'the son of Zeus,' did more to assure his conquest than if he had enrolled a hundred and twenty thousand fresh Macedonians.

Napoleon, who used to imagine himself as one of Plutarch's heroes, remembered during his own Egyptian campaign Alexander's respectful attitude to the religious teachers of the Egypt of that earlier



#### TRADE CENTRE FOUNDED BY ALEXANDER

Having decided to build in Egypt a port that should be the focus of eastern commerce, Alexander chose a suitable site and there laid the foundations of the city called Alexandria in his honour. The early plan may yet be traced, although the Heptastadium has now been converted into an isthmus by silting.

day, and he actually prepared designs for the building of a mosque. It was the policy of ancient conquerors to conciliate the gods of conquered nations. When Alexander reached India he questioned the Brahmins as Caesar questioned the Druids in Britain, and as Napoleon questioned the priests of Islam in Syria. Alexander must frequently have heard his mother talk of the great Oracle of Zeus at Dodona in Epirus, her own country, and since the oracle of Zeus Ammon in the Libyan oasis was venerated in Greece, it was natural that he should visit it. The oracles were 'places of questioning' in the ancient world, and we can imagine how the adventurous, eager mind of Alexander was busy with what the future might still have in store for him.

The future had only seven years in store for him, but what years! We shall refer later to the psychological change which contact with the East wrought in his character. Meanwhile, he moved from one military and political success to another. After the fall of Tyre even the Athenians sent a special embassy to declare their loyalty to the champion of Greece against Asia. So that, with his name already known all over the civilized world, Alexander set out to meet Darius for a final decision beyond the rivers of Babylon. Darius appears to have been at last aware that the newcomer from Europe was invincible, and he was ready to come to terms. He therefore sent envoys with proposals for a treaty of peace. He offered all the territory west of the Euphrates, ten thousand talents as ransom for the captives taken at the battle of Issus, and one of his own daughters as a bride for Alexander. (The talent was worth about two hundred and forty pounds, with probably six times the purchasing power of our money.) A weaker man might have accepted such terms. 'If I were Alexander,' said the Chief of Staff, 'I would accept them.' Alexander's reply was characteristic of his irony and wit: 'And so should I, if I were Parmenio.' It was a case in which as yet no compromise was possible.

After the final victory Alexander was, indeed, so eager to reconcile East and West that he offended his own followers, and his later oriental policy caused mutinies and even plots against his life. Meanwhile, he decided for ordeal by battle in the very centre of the enemy's empire. And at last Darius was able to choose his own ground in the Mesopotamian plain where his vast forces and their reserves could be manoeuvred to the utmost advantage. The army of Alexander had grown with his progress, for every victory had brought new recruits. But its size was disproportionate to the Persian masses recruited from all the vassal lands which still acknowledged the sovereignty of the Great King. It was rumoured too that the Persians had devised new engines of war in the shape of scythed chariots for the express purpose of mowing down the Macedonian phalanx. The sensation which the first appearance of the new invention caused must have been similar to the sensation caused by the British tanks in the Great War.

Darius had assembled his army at Babylon, and he then moved up the eastern bank of the Tigris to Gaugamela where the battle was fought. Popular tradition, as Plutarch mentions, erroneously supposed that the scene of this great encounter was Arbela (modern Erbil) which lies fifty miles to the east. The month was September, 331 B.C. The sight of the Persian army, the extent of its camp, appear to have overawed the veterans like Parmenio who, according to Arrian, advised an attack by night in order that the darkness might conceal from the soldiers of Macedon the fearful odds against them. Alexander is described as having replied that he would not steal a victory. Probably his real reason was that he desired his men to have a night's rest after a long and fatiguing march, and, indeed, Arrian attributes scientific considerations for Alexander's decision to give battle on the following day.


We are afforded an arresting picture of the night scene which preceded an engagement on which the fate of European civilization depended. The plain between

Eve of the  
decisive fight

the river and the Gordyaeon mountains was lit up by the bivouac fires of the Persians, and from their camps there came a continual noise like the roar of the sea. In ancient war the hostile forces often lay for a long time in sight of each other. Darius held a review by torchlight. One wonders whether, as Napoleon watched the torchlight dance of his seventy thousand men on the frosty eve which preceded the battle of Austerlitz, he remembered Plutarch's description of the torch-illuminated ranks of the army of Darius? Alexander spent the night differently. Alone with his soothsayer, Aristander, he passed many hours before his tent celebrating religious rites. It sounds strangely to us that he 'sacrificed to the god Fear.' Was it for the purpose of warding off panic from his small army? Was it to implore those invisible agents that paralyse the actions of men to hide their presence—if they existed at all? Throughout his campaign Alexander was accompanied by his seer and soothsayer, whom he frequently consulted, as a great commander of a later day, Wallenstein (1583-1634), frequently consulted his astrologer. Assured of the aid of the gods Alexander slept tranquilly that night; he seems to have possessed Napoleon's gift of going to sleep at will even immediately after the arduous study of maps.

Small as his army was in comparison with the army of Darius, it now numbered almost fifty thousand men including seven thousand cavalry. And once again the shock tactics of the Macedonian cavalry prepared the way for the assault by the phalanx which at the psychological moment 'rolled on the enemy like a flood.' By another of his humanising touches Plutarch tells us that Alexander had begun to spare Bucephalus because the horse was growing old. During his inspection of the ranks he rode another horse. 'But whenever Alexander went into action Bucephalus would be led up, and the King mounted him and immediately led the attack.'

Perhaps the chief interest in the tactics of Alexander as described by Arrian consists in the fact that at the battle of Gaugamela the Macedonian line extended only to about the length of the enemy's



#### BATTLE THAT GAINED PERSIA

When he engaged the new army of Darius at Gaugamela, Alexander again adopted the tactics that he had proved at Issus. With the heavy cavalry he shattered the Persian centre, but not before his own left wing was partially broken.

centre. The risk of encirclement was obvious. The flanks of the Macedonian army, however, were protected by specially devised reserves held in the rear of both wings for the purpose of meeting any outflanking movement. Like Napoleon at Austerlitz, Alexander had decided to tear open the enemy centre.

On his right the ground was hilly. In order, therefore, to render the scythed chariots useless he moved his line to the right, expecting that the Persian line would likewise be moved a corresponding distance to their left. This happened. But when Darius perceived the significance of Alexander's move he launched a cavalry attack on the Macedonian right, which, at first successful, was later repulsed. The scythed chariots were then ordered to bear down on the phalanx, but by a steady rain of arrows and by the use of the long pikes the horses were disabled or killed, and the onrush was stopped. Still more remarkable was the order to the leaders of the phalanx to open the ranks suddenly so as

The Battle  
of Gaugamela



to let pass those chariots which had not been arrested and then to close the ranks as suddenly after they had passed through.

But Alexander's eye was fixed on the Persian centre as Napoleon's was fixed on the Russian centre which held the heights of Pratzen. Napoleon used

**Narrow escape of King Darius** his right wing as a bait to draw a Russian attack, and while the attack was in


progress he overwhelmed Kutusoff's centre by a superior force. Alexander had used his right wing for much the same purpose. The Persian movement to the left had weakened the Persian centre, and then, after the chariots had been rendered useless, Alexander launched his main attack against the centre and burst through. The scene of the battle of Issus was repeated. Darius, however, might have been captured if at a critical moment Parmenio, hard pressed on the left, had not called for assistance. It appears that he was afraid that the stores might be captured. Plutarch mentions that the appeal was made twice, and a detachment of cavalry was sent to support him. Meantime the chariot of Darius was entangled among the heaped dead; the battle was going against him, and once more he escaped. He mounted a mare and fled. During the pursuit, which was interrupted by nightfall, the Macedonians failed to overtake the fugitive king. Alexander never forgave Parmenio because

the cavalry who might have captured Darius had been unnecessarily diverted to protect the left at a moment when the battle was practically won.

Nevertheless, Alexander had gained another victory for Europe in the conflict with Asia. And it was still as a European that he wrote to the Greeks of the homeland and told them that 'all tyrannies were now at an end and they might consider themselves autonomous.' After Babylon, Susa, Persepolis and Pasargadae with their accumulated treasure had fallen into his hands he continued to remember the reason why he

had come to destroy Persia, although there are indications that a new idea was already dawning in his mind. Once he saw a great statue of Xerxes which had been overturned and lay prone as a symbol of the Persian overthrow. He stood over it for some time, and then exclaimed: 'Ought I to let thee lie thus because of thy war against Greece or, since thou hadst a great spirit and valour, should I set thee up again?' As if thinking out the problem he remained silent and then walked away.

The episode may mark the beginning of his new policy of endeavouring to reconcile the interests of the West and the East. It may have been only to satisfy the histrionic tastes of his companions, who suggested that just as Xerxes had burned Athens so Alexander should in revenge burn the palace of Xerxes, that, torch in hand and with a garland on his head, he led the way and set the palace on fire. Arrian states that the dramatic act had long been designed; but Alexander repented, and ordered the fire to be extinguished. The soldiers believed that the burning of the Persian palace was a signal that the campaign was finished and they would be led back to their homes. But the end was not yet. Alexander was still eager to meet Darius in person, and three years of arduous fighting were required to subdue the lands of Persia. At last it was only the corpse



TEMPLE RESPECTED BY CONQUERORS

Wherever he went Alexander not only tolerated but even revered the local gods. It is recorded that when he occupied Babylon he offered sacrifice daily on the altar before the entrance of a great temple by the palace gate—which must mean the temple of Nin-Makh here restored (see also page 930).

*After Koldewey*



#### ROCK-STREWN DESOLATION TRAVERSED BY THE MACEDONIAN ARMY

When Alexander had destroyed Persian power in central Asia, making himself supreme and establishing cities of the Greek type, he was free to march upon India. While he turned aside, with his light infantry, to subdue marauding hill tribes his main force advanced direct from Kabul to the Indus by way of the Khyber Pass. They would have to cross the bleak Shagai plateau, and perhaps, anticipating the modern troops seen in this photograph, found it convenient to pitch camp there.

*Photo, E.N.A.*

of the Great King which Alexander beheld, because Darius had been assassinated by one of his own satraps.

The numerous battles and skirmishes which developed out of the pursuit of Darius must not detain us here. As Alexander advanced insurrections frequently broke out in the rear, and he turned to quell them. It was in Iran where, although he was unaware of it, he was fighting the tribes which had the same 'Aryan' blood as the Macedonians that he encountered the fiercest opposition. In 329 B.C. he reached the Kabul valley, and in the spring of 328 he crossed the Hindu Kush. In 327 he was in Sogdiana (Bokhara) and after the submission of the native princes he married, to the astonishment of his followers, Roxana, the daughter of Oxyartes. He planted numerous cities, since to a Greek a city was the sign and nucleus of civilization. It has even been supposed that the name of Kandahar is a corruption of Alexandria.

Alexander told his war-weary veterans, who were clamorous to return to their hearths, that if the army withdrew too soon from Asia, having now thrown it

into political confusion, the 'barbarians' would attack them and a rearguard action would require to be fought all the way. Nevertheless, he offered them their discharge. At these words, the men rallied to him at once and shouted that they would follow him to any part of the world. And so Alexander prepared to pass into India. We may notice here that it was while he was in the North-West Borderland that he scaled the famous fortress called by the Greeks Aornos—the Birdless—in which new interest has been aroused through the apparently successful identification of the mountain by Sir Aurel Stein. It has been suggested that the word 'Aornos,' however, may be only a Greek corruption of the Sanskrit 'Avarana,' which meant a fortress. It lies some thirty miles above the junction of the Copen (Kabul river) and the Indus. Over the Indus Alexander had ordered a bridge to be built, and he passed across it into the Punjab in 326 B.C.

Now, just as there were historical and political reasons for Alexander's seizure of Syria and Egypt, so his advance into India is not to be explained by



#### RECORD OF THE DEFEAT OF PORUS

The battle of the Hydaspes, Alexander's supreme triumph in India, is commemorated in this issue—two coins are shown—minted by his successors in the East. On one side he is represented on horseback, charging the elephant on which is the Indian king Porus; on the other as a god, crowned by victory.

*British Museum*

'mere greed of conquest.' Persian influence had penetrated there long before his day. Indians had been brought by Xerxes to fight against Greece in the preceding century. Moreover, according to Arrian, who is the most trustworthy historian of Alexander's campaigns, an Indian contingent had fought in the army of Darius at the battle of Gaugamela. These facts alone justify Alexander's prolongation of the war, since it was necessary to reach the last confines of Persian dominion.

Having gained the friendship of the Indian Prince Taxiles, whose state lay between the Indus and the Hydaspes (the modern Jhelum), Alexander advanced towards the latter river, because the king whom the Greeks named Porus was waiting on the farther bank to dispute the passage. The army of Porus numbered between thirty and forty thousand men, and he had some two hundred elephants. The Greeks had seen a few elephants at Gaugamela, but it was a startling experience to find so many of those great beasts now ranged against them.

The battle of the Hydaspes was fought in the spring of B.C. 326, when the river was swollen owing to the melting of the snows. Even as late as the Augustan age, Horace (65-8 B.C.) describes the Hydaspes as 'fabulosus,' a river of romance and legend. But the battle scene as painted by Arrian makes the river a very real factor in the fortune of the day. For Alexander used his forces as a modern tactician would use them in similar circumstances. He was supposed to be awaiting the subsidence of the flood, and he allowed his enemy to continue in that belief. He further deceived Porus by making a series of feints at crossing now at this point and now at that, but those apparent attempts to gain the other side masked a different plan. There was only one ford much higher up the river where the infantry

could pass over with comparative ease. At that point, which was about ten miles distant from the Macedonian encampment, there was an island in midstream, and it was thickly wooded. Having left the bulk of his army under Craterus, with orders to remain in position opposite the enemy, Alexander withdrew part of his forces with a strong detachment of cavalry and, by a detour of some fifteen miles, arrived at the chosen point for crossing.

The river was forded during a night of heavy rain, and then by a rapid march Alexander took Porus completely by surprise. The Indian leader was compelled to wheel his forces to meet the attack from a wholly unexpected direction at the very moment when the main army of Macedon began to cross the river. Alexander, personally leading thirteen thousand troops, had thus turned the flank of Porus, whose plans had been thrown into confusion. He was practically surrounded, because the attack in the rear by the forces from over the river was timed to take place during the

**King Porus**  
outmanoeuvred

frontal attack by Alexander. The chaos of the scene, with the horses and elephants struggling amid a confusion of infantrymen with their pikes, swords and shields, is vividly brought before us by Arrian, who describes the elephants retreating 'like ships backing water.' The old rajah was defeated, but Arrian and Plutarch agree in their account of the extreme courtesy displayed by Alexander. Arrian says that they met as two brave men meet. When Alexander asked Porus how he desired to be treated, the proud Hindu replied, 'Royally.' And royally Alexander behaved, because he not only appointed Porus satrap of the province, but increased its territory.

It is pleasant to contrast Alexander's chivalrous treatment of a chivalrous enemy with the demeanour of Caesar towards the brave Gaul Vercingetorix after the fall of Alesia. Vercingetorix rode out in his finest armour through the gate of the city to the spot where Caesar remained seated to receive him. Then Vercingetorix stripped himself of his armour and sat at the victor's feet. But Caesar ordered that the fallen chief was to be kept a prisoner, and then to be

led captive through the streets of Rome. Alexander had a far warmer temperament, and Plutarch tells us that he was by nature 'munificent,' and that he considered the mastery of himself a more kindly act than the overthrow of enemies. It was after the battle of the Hydaspes that Bucephalus died, thirty years old, 'from wounds for which he was under treatment,' and we are given a description of the grief of Alexander, who 'felt that he had lost a comrade.'

It was Alexander's ambition to reach the Ganges, but mutinies again broke out among the soldiers, who were as disappointed with India as the soldiers of Napoleon were with Egypt. On the arrival of the army of Macedon at the river Hyphasis (modern Beas) the men refused to go farther. Alexander shut himself up in his tent, hoping that the mutineers would once more rally to him. But they were stale and war-weary, and the great leader was compelled to begin preparations for the return. To the genius of a military chief he added the curiosity of the explorer, collected and provisioned a fleet, sailed down the Punjab rivers towards the Indus, and reached the delta in midsummer 325



**WHERE THE MACEDONIAN TROOPS RESTED BEFORE MEETING PORUS**

Situated in the Punjab at a point where important caravan routes converged, the ancient city of Taxila must have been a busy commercial centre. It consisted of irregular, rubble buildings, often of considerable size—surviving ruins are seen above—at the period when it was occupied by Alexander, in his advance on Porus, so that his men might be refreshed before the imminent battle.

*Courtesy of Sir John Marshall, Director-General of Archaeology in India*

Even after he had been wounded almost to death in the storming of the town of the Malli (the modern town of Multan) his energy remained exhaustless. He instructed his admiral, Nearchus, to sail from the mouth of the Indus to the Persian Gulf while the monsoon was blowing, and then in late autumn set his face westwards. His far eastern campaigns, and their results, are treated more fully in Chap. 49.

A terrible three months' march through the desert of Baluchistan caused, in totally different conditions, losses proportionately

as great as the losses in  
 Explorer, Soldier Napoleon's army in the  
 and Administrator retreat from Moscow.

Almost half the army perished owing to heat, hunger and thirst. Alexander's objective was Susa, which he reached in the spring of 324 and where many administrative problems awaited him. Only one year of life remained, and it was to be spent in organizing the immense empire which he had won.

True statesman as he was, he desired the co-operation of the conquered in the scheme of government, but his policy alienated many of his Macedonian and Greek followers. They were unable to grasp his intention or to share his large views. He offered satrapies to Persian grandees familiar with the customs of the country, discharged the grumbling Macedonian veterans, drilled some thirty thousand Persian youths and taught them the discipline of the army which had brought the power of the West into the East, and he even gave appointments to Asian princes in his 'agema' or household cavalry. This change in his attitude to his former enemies bewildered his old comrades. It is one of the lessons of history that the synthetic genius of the statesman must always struggle against regional, parochial and separatist influences.

Alexander was always tempted to do everything on the largest scale. He paid the debts contracted by his soldiers to the amount of twenty thousand talents, and then he ordered them to marry Persian wives. There was an extraordinary, an almost Rabelaisian marriage scene at Susa when Alexander wedded Statira, the daughter of Darius, while some hundred of his generals married Persian ladies.

According to Arrian, a marriage register was drawn up, and more than ten thousand Macedonians united themselves in wedlock with the daughters of Persia. It may all seem very fantastic, but it was Alexander's way of proclaiming the need for co-operation between East and West.

Alexander went to Babylon in the spring of 323 B.C., and here he found awaiting him various foreign embassies who had come to pay homage to the conqueror of the East. There is a legend that envoys from Rome were among the number. Who can measure the different course which history might have taken if Alexander had lived to arrest the growing power of Carthage? In little more than fifty years after his death the First Punic war began. The emergence of Rome as the next great World State would have been thwarted or at least retarded if Alexander had been in northern Africa towards the close of the fourth century. But in

June, 323, he fell ill at Babylon, and some sus- Alexander's last  
 pected that, since his sud- days in Babylon  
 den sickness took place immediately after a banquet, he had been poisoned. That suspicion was never rooted out of the mind of his mother Olympias, who took terrible vengeance on the supposed murderers. The general opinion, modern as well as ancient, however, supports the belief that his death was the result of natural causes. In the fierce heat of a Babylonian summer a frame undermined by so many years of constant and manifold labour easily succumbed to the fever of the plain. The court bulletins which are quoted by Plutarch and Arrian indicate the natural symptoms of a fever's rapid course.

Nevertheless, as we approach the end we seem to enter the atmosphere of a Greek or a Shakespearian tragedy. Alexander had already been perturbed by many omens. He became, according to Plutarch, the victim of superstition which, in a remarkable phrase, is likened to water seeking the lowest levels and which, therefore, fills the mind when it is at its lowest and weakest. Once, shortly before the fatal fever struck him, he had stripped to play ball with his aides-de-camp. When his companions returned to the dressing-

room they saw a strange man seated in the king's chair, wearing the diadem and the robes. Questioned as to who he was he remained speechless, but afterwards declared that he had been sent thither by the god Serapis to sit on the King's throne, and to put on the stole and the diadem, and to remain silent! It is like a scene from Hamlet or Macbeth. Arrian and Plutarch both narrate that Serapis had a temple at Babylon. As Alexander grew worse, two of his friends were sent to inquire of the god whether the sick king should not be brought into the precincts of the Serapeum. The answer was No. And yet Serapis became the new god of Egypt and was first worshipped at Alexandria, which Alexander had founded.

We are left without an explanation as to why the dying king was advised to remain in the palace, which swarmed with anxious generals, soldiers, soothsayers, sorcerers and priests busy with sacrifices and atonements. In vain Nearchus, the admiral, came to his master's bedside to cheer him with tales of 'the great sea,' and of all that the navy had seen in the voyage from the Indus.

Scenes round the death bed Alexander was suffering from the malarial fever of which we read in the earlier Babylonian incantations. It was accompanied probably by that 'malady of the head' which in the ritual of the exorcists was depicted as 'fixed like a tiara,' clamping the head. He had been engaged in the completion of plans for a new expedition. Army and fleet were in readiness to start for Arabia. But he became delirious. During one of the lucid moments he was asked to whom he desired to bequeath the Empire, and he replied: 'To the best man.' He died while the sun was setting

on the Babylonian Plain on the evening of June 13, 323 B.C.

Plutarch's 'comparison' between Alexander and Caesar is missing, but if it was ever written their characters must have offered precisely those similarities and contrasts which Plutarch delighted to portray. No doubt he would have reminded us that it was in Thessaly, on ground which must have been familiar to Alexander, that Caesar won the battle of Pharsalus which made him all but in name the monarch of Rome. Caesar's dispositions at that battle seem to indicate that he had made a close study of the tactics of the king of Macedon. Like Alexander he led the right wing, and he used his infantry in the centre as Alexander used his phalanx. Caesar criticised Pompey's error in having ordered his foot soldiers to await the attack in close formation, whereas Caesar threw his centre en masse and with the

utmost momentum against the centre of the enemy and broke it. These were the tactics of Alexander.

In politics, too, when the moment was convenient, Caesar, like Alexander, also used shock tactics. The East fascinated both men as it later fascinated Napoleon. Caesar also went warring in Asia Minor (Zela, 47 B.C.) and in Africa (Thapsus, 46 B.C.). He spent some nine months in Egypt, and like Napoleon captured Alexandria, which bore the name of the man whom they both emulated. But compared with what we have called Alexander's vast itinerary Caesar's route march of Empire was shorter. He did not throw the radius of his name and fame so far across Asia. He was always nearer his base, whereas Alexander's line of communications was so lengthened that it may be said to have snapped.



PATRON OF ALEXANDRIA

As Alexander, superstitious to the last, lay dying in Babylon he sought comfort in the worship of a god traditionally identified with Serapis, whose worship later grew up at Alexandria.

British Museum

When Caesar carried the war into Gaul he had Italy behind him, and when he carried it into Britain he had already made sure of Gaul. Before he finally marched against Pompey he was careful 'to leave not a single enemy in his rear.' Alexander took more tremendous risks, for Greece was swarming with his enemies, while Persia held the sea.

It was Caesar's habit to return frequently to Rome or to be at least within striking distance, because he was a politician as well as a soldier.

**Alexander and Caesar compared** Alexander was never a politician but a law giver from the beginning. It was unnecessary for a king's son to buy his way to power as Caesar bought it. Immersed in political intrigue Caesar required a colder, more calculating, almost Jesuitical mind. Cicero is credited with having been the first to penetrate the façade of Caesar's character, and he feared his policy 'as one might fear the smiling surface of the sea.' But Alexander was delivered from the need of all mean subterfuge. A single purpose propelled him. It was to avenge Greece, and if the process of avenging brought empires in its train it was because a military genius of the first rank directed the operations. He seems far more 'objective' in his aims, more open in his character and infinitely more magnanimous. Caesar lavished money on friends and foes alike, but it was for political reasons. We cannot imagine Alexander stooping to assist the political career of a man who had been his wife's paramour or to accept the help of that same man (Clodius) to drive a political opponent (Cicero) out of the country. Caesar after his death was acclaimed generous because in his will he had left a gift to every Roman citizen. When Alexander was starting on his hazardous journey he divided all his possessions among his friends, and when asked what he had reserved for himself he replied, 'My hopes.'

As Hannibal devoted his life to the destruction of Rome, Alexander dedicated all his powers to the destruction of Persia for the sake of Greece. It is no doubt true that in pure military genius and in

his astonishing tactical resource Hannibal surpassed Alexander, but they equalled each other in daring. Hannibal finally failed, whereas fortune never forsook Alexander. In the career of each of them there is a certain idealism which appears to be lacking in Caesar and Napoleon. Caesar conquered Gaul for the purpose of conquering Rome, as Napoleon fought outside France and Frederick the Great outside Prussia for the sake of personal ambition.

There is a sense in which the victories of all other commanders seem parochial in comparison with those of Alexander. Napoleon attempted to reshuffle the Europe which he despised, and succeeded in obliterating many frontiers, but when he fell, things became what they had been as trees that bend to the storm stand erect when the storm has passed. His schemes disappeared like the smoke of his battles. But the course of western civilization cannot be explained without reference to Alexander the Great.

Caesar, indeed, by **Western Civilization's debt to Alexander** the conquest of Gaul which spread Roman law and culture throughout Europe had a more immediate influence on the western world. But if Alexander had not preceded him, and had not defended Greek civilization against the encroachments of the Orient, the history of Rome herself would have been utterly different. There would have been at least a retardation by centuries of the development of Public Law and of those democratic institutions which, in spite of their dangers and their failures, best express the political and social ideals of Europe.

The legend of Alexander penetrated many lands. He had fired the imagination of the ancient world to such a degree that after his death there was an Alexander cult and on coins his likeness displaced the likenesses of the gods. He had left so deep an impression in Persia that as 'Iskander' he was actually made to figure as one of the Persian royal family, so that Persia claimed him as her own. His career, with fantastic and magical embellishments, was recorded in all languages. Arabian and Ethiopian as well as European writers were busy with his

romance during centuries. When literature and learning had perished in Greece the city which he founded in Egypt became its home. His name was even given to the measure which became characteristic of much of the poetry of France, because 'Alexandrine verse' was shaped in the romances which gathered round his name during the Middle Ages. No doubt the fascination which he has exercised over mankind is to be explained by the glamour of success achieved on so great a scale during the glamour of adolescence.

But the modern world is still interested in his constructive statesmanship, and although the science of war has developed on lines undreamed of by him his tactics are still studied.

We may revert for a moment to his military career in order to remind the reader that its unrivalled achievements were made possible only because a small but highly disciplined European army was pitted against Asiatics. Without the heavy Macedonian cavalry and the Macedonian phalanx Alexander could have done nothing. Marshal Foch has pointed out that the basic principles of war remain unaltered. At the battles of Issus and Gaugamela there were no guns, no trench mortars, no field telephones, no motor transport, no tanks and no aeroplanes. But every army, whatever its equipment in the field, has a right, a left and a centre. The genius of every great commander has consisted in his discovery of the point at which to make the most irreparable lesion in the enemy's line. Napoleon summed up the problem which had faced Alexander as it faced himself: 'A great leader must ask himself many times a day: If the enemy appear on my front, my right or my left, what should I do? If he finds that he cannot answer that question he has chosen his ground wrongly.' It was because Alexander had always chosen his ground rightly that from the throne of Macedon he ascended the throne of the world.

In closing this sketch we may now ask, What effect upon a man's character has the concentration in his hands of such power as Alexander's? It was the belief of the Greeks that moderate success was

the lot for which the human being was best fitted, and that if he attempted to grow too great he only brought upon himself the anger of the gods. Alexander must have frequently remembered the ethics which Aristotle had taught him, and as a student of Aeschylus he was familiar with the conception of those Fates and Dooms which accompany man on his earthly journey.

In his career, as in the careers of Caesar and Napoleon, we observe that the advance to supreme power was overshadowed by increasing suspicion and by the fear of conspiracy. Even Napoleon suspected his generals of aiming at his own throne. 'There is not one of them,' he said, 'who does not think that he has the same right to the throne as I have... My power within and without is founded on fear.' Alexander would have convicted him of that overweening pride always punished by Nemesis when, after the disaster of Moscow, he said to Jomini, 'When a man has never had catastrophes he should have them at least on as great a scale as his own fortune.' And he had them. The hour came when, as if filled with the nausea of power, he confessed that 'it is an evil business to be always fighting,' and that 'next to a battle lost the greatest misery is a battle gained.'

In the case of Caesar we seem to notice a great mind gradually sinking under the delirium of its own ambition.

He had a golden throne prepared for himself and appeared before the people in triumphal attire. He insisted on divine honours; his image was carried beside the images of the gods, and priests were installed to arrange for his worship. He offended the people by his arrogant bearing towards their Tribunes, and perhaps his greatest blunder was his last triumph in the streets of Rome when he celebrated a victory not over the foreigner but over the sons of Pompey, one of the greatest of the Romans, so that the citizens 'were vexed as they had never been vexed.' Like Alexander, Caesar also was long troubled by omens, and he felt that a circle of friends had gradually become a circle of foes.

In the case of Alexander it is useless to attempt to idealise him as Mommsen idealised Caesar. His errors are known



to us. In his reprisals against individuals as well as against states he frequently betrayed the terrible vindictiveness which was characteristic of his age. Nevertheless, he appears to have withstood many of the temptations which attend unlimited power, and he remained human throughout. The old belief that, like Caesar, he demanded divine honours is now wholly discredited. We have seen, indeed, that he made crafty use of the superstition of his day, and had himself declared 'the son of Zeus.' In ancient life, and especially in the East, there was the closest relation between the kingship and the gods of the state, but there is no real evidence that the Alexander cult existed during Alexander's lifetime. It became fashionable after his death, and arose round the tomb in which he was buried in Alexandria.

It is admitted that he had become orientalised and that after his contact with the East his habits and ideas became more

**Policy, not  
megalomania**

grandiose than they could have been if he had remained the king of a small Greek state like Macedon.

To the disgust of his followers he assumed the Persian dress, and introduced the Persian court etiquette which required prostration in the monarch's presence. But the reasons were largely political. What his critics supposed to be Persomania meant only or chiefly that he was adapting himself to new conditions of government. He was eager to begin the work of reconstruction and reconciliation and to identify himself for that purpose with the East as well as with the West. If Napoleon had captured India and Babylonia he would have carried out a similar policy. But there is no doubt that a mist of suspicion and distrust arose between Alexander and certain of his Greek companions who misunderstood the psychological change which had taken place in him.

Philotas, the commander of the cavalry, and the son of Parmenio, the old Chief of Staff, was convicted of conspiring against

the king's life and was executed. There were other executions, because Alexander suspected his generals as he suspected his cupbearers. Even Parmenio was put to death, and we do not know if he was guilty. If he was innocent it is impossible to forgive Alexander. But conspiracy was in the air, and at that juncture while the great campaign was not yet completed it was impossible to be mild. The severest discipline was necessary because the fate of the army depended on the preservation of the king's life. In gusts of anger he had struck down friends and foes, but he was guilty of no premeditated crime such as Napoleon's murder of the Duc d'Enghien.

To the end Alexander retained the affection of his army. That he never lost his robust character and his self-denial even amid the luxuries of the East is proved by the following incident. During a march in the torrid light and heat of Asia men and horses were maddened by thirst as they passed through a waterless tract. A small quantity of water had, however, been found, and some of the soldiers brought it in a helmet to Alexander. He took the helmet, but when he looked round and saw the eager eyes of his soldiers fixed on the water he refused to drink, and said: 'If I were to drink alone, these horsemen of mine would lose heart.' This was the spirit which he had displayed throughout the long campaign which had lasted during thirteen years. There are signs that, surrounded by his triumphs, he was aware of their insecurity. He was never wholly dazzled by the stupendous gifts of fortune and the glare of power. Once he stood silent beside the tomb of Cyrus, and read the inscription: 'O man, whosoever thou art and whence-soever thou comest, for come thou wilt, I am Cyrus who won the Empire for the Persians. Grudge me not, therefore, this handful of earth which covers me.' And we are told that Alexander betrayed great emotion, being reminded of the uncertainty and the transience of human things.

# THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS: THEIR TRIUMPHS AND FAILURES

Fruits of the Greek Genius at Work upon the  
Problems of Logic Metaphysics and Ethics

By EDWYN BEVAN D.Litt. LL.D.

Lecturer on Hellenistic History and Literature, King's College, London; Author of *Stoics and Sceptics*, *Hellenism and Christianity*, etc.

IN the succeeding chapter it will be shown how European science took its start among the Greeks in the early years of the sixth century, B.C. It is the purpose of the present chapter to trace the course of Greek philosophy, of which all our European philosophy is the continuation. Science and philosophy, however, were not originally distinct; the man described as a 'philosopher' was also the man who attempted to give a scientific explanation of the phenomena of the world; even up to quite recent times what we call science was often called 'natural philosophy.' But though in reviewing Greek philosophy we shall largely be dealing with the same individuals who, in the next chapter, will be spoken of as scientific speculators, there is a real distinction between science and philosophy, and in the ancient Greek world, as time went on, the specialists in the one tended to be different from those in the other.

We may say that the characteristic of philosophy is that it does not, like science, set out to give explanations as to how some part of the facts of the world come about in connexion with some other part of the facts of the world; but it asks, first, how the world as a whole is to be understood in connexion with the human mind which studies it, whether the background to everything that exists and everything that happens is a spiritual reality or not, and, if so, what kind of a spiritual reality—the department of philosophy which to-day we call metaphysics. Then, secondly, philosophy asks what value the processes of the human mind have in regard to reality, what 'knowledge' means, what the conditions

of knowledge are—the department of philosophy called logic or epistemology. And thirdly, philosophy asks what is the meaning and value of the judgements which men pass when they affirm that certain things 'ought' to be, or 'ought not' to be, when they classify things as 'good' or 'bad'—the department of philosophy called ethics. The ancient Greek 'philosophers' began to think about these things, just as they began to seek for the scientific explanation of particular bits of the world—the earth, the heavenly bodies, thunder and rain, the growth of plants, the bodies of animals and men.

The word 'philosophos' in Greek means 'lover of wisdom.' The early Ionian speculators to be spoken of presently were apparently not called philosophers but wise men, 'sophoi' or 'sophistai.' A fanciful writer of the fourth century B.C., in one of his fictitious dialogues, represented Pythagoras (whether truly or not we cannot say) as being the first to introduce the term 'philosophos'—a more modest description. Pythagoras might not have a right to be called 'wise,' but he 'loved wisdom' and followed after wisdom. At any rate, the terms 'philosophos,' 'philosophia,' seem to have started in Pythagorean circles, and from the fifth century B.C. onwards 'philosophos' was the ordinary word used in the Greek world to describe a man who devoted himself to speculation about the universe and about human good and evil.

It must be remembered that when Greeks set out to discover the explanation

Meaning of the  
word *Philosopher*

of the world, they were confronted with a strange doubleness in the things round them, and in themselves. There were all the lifeless material things which could never be seen moving except when something outside them made them move, and which, when they were once set in motion, went on moving by fixed mechanical laws, without varying the movement by any will of their own—such as stones or logs of wood. There were also the living things which moved by some

force within them, especially human beings, who moved themselves under the impulse of non-material things, such as desires and emotions and judgements of what was good and evil, and whose movements were indefinitely variable by their own choice. Movement of these two kinds, mechanical movement and voluntary movement, was a matter of every-day experience. And when they looked at the great moving world as a whole—the movement of the stars so impressively regular, the movement of all things on the earth, rivers and winds and fire—men had to decide whether to regard all these movements as being like those of animal life, or like those of a dead stone.

The old mythological explanations of the world which came down to the Greeks of the sixth century from earlier generations had introduced the personal agency of supposed divine beings, by whom the world had been made or procreated, as an egg or a child is procreated. The epoch-making step taken by the Ionian speculators in the sixth century is that they set out to find an explanation for the world which did not introduce super-human intelligent activity, but only mechanical, invariable law. The essential characteristic of Greek civilization, as it then declared itself, was rationalism, and the rationalism which is one distinctive element in modern Western civilization is simply the development of a process of thought which was begun, as a new thing in the story of mankind, by the ancient Greeks. When Thales said that the world was made of water, it was a first blind shot in the dark; but the important thing was that it attempted to give a

scientific and mechanical explanation of the world instead of a mythological one.

Yet one cannot understand the problem which the Greek philosophers had to solve unless one sees its later aspect. It is quite plain to us to-day that a great part of the world really is governed by fixed mechanical law, and with regard to all that part of the world science can make progress only so far as it rules out any supposition of spiritual agency. For science deals with that which is strictly measurable and calculable. It is in regard to the material world that science has been so marvellously successful and given Western man to-day so unprecedented a command over physical forces. That is the splendid fruit of Greek rationalism. But all the time the human spirit has been at work as well as material forces; and the operations of the human spirit, the moving of matter as a consequence of desire and thought and will, still to-day await a satisfactory rational explanation. To-day many of those who are recognized in Western countries as competent philosophic thinkers hold that, although spiritual agencies do not interfere with the movements of the natural world in the way primitive folk imagined, the moving world as a whole has behind it something of a spiritual nature, something best revealed to us in the human mind. We can understand then how the ancient Greek thinkers who set out to find a rationalist explanation for the world soon found themselves still under the necessity of somehow bringing in Mind.

At the outset those thinkers had no clear conception of the difference between mind and matter. They were capable of fancying **The Soul** a that the soul inside man **Material** thing was a material substance, a sort of air or fire. For the movement of the world as a whole the early Ionian philosophers thought a mechanical explanation sufficient. The movement was, they said, an endless circular movement, like that of a whirlwind or an eddy. From that cosmic whirl—'dinos' in Greek—all lesser movements in the world ultimately came. Such a hypothesis obviated the necessity of supposing any Divine Person behind the universe. A

comic poet, making fun on the stage of the Ionian philosophy, put it in the line :

Dinos is king, and the old god driven out.

When Heraclitus of Ephesus (c. 540-475 B.C.—see page 1471) made fire the essential stuff in all things, he chose the element which might seem to be of its own nature perpetually in movement, and since Heraclitus thought that souls also were fire of a particularly 'dry' quality (the drier the better), one may say that in a way he thought of the movement of the world as like the movement caused by soul. Only, because thought in that phase still identified mind and matter, one cannot say that his explanation of the world was either spiritual or material.

With Pythagoras (born about 582 B.C.) quite a new conception came in, derived from the 'mystical' religious movement which was then sweeping through the Greek world. The essential idea of the Orphic and other similar communities (see page 1385) was that the soul in man was a divine being which had become imprisoned, or entombed, in the unclean body, and that the sinful soul even after death would always be condemned to another incarnation, so that only by purifications of some kind—certain ritual acts, certain abstinences, a special self-discipline—could the soul win free and return to its divine home. Ideas of this sort were adopted by Pythagoras—the strange long-haired prophet and master, dim-seen through a halo of miraculous legend in the dawn of the great age of Greece—and embodied in the Pythagorean brotherhoods. Such ideas were to influence Plato, and, in some form or other, become an abiding element in later Greek thought about Man and his destiny.

Another man, poet and prophet and 'medicine-man' as well as philosopher, the Sicilian Empedocles (c. 500 to 430 B.C.), taught a similar doctrine about a fall of the soul and deliverance by purifications. And in his great philosophic poem he expounded a theory of the world which came nearer to bringing in spiritual agency. The matter of the world, he taught, consisted of various mixtures of the

four elements, Earth, Air, Fire and Water (Empedocles was the first to introduce the doctrine of the four elements into Greek scientific tradition; see page 1474), and the movement of the world was caused by the operation of two antagonistic principles, Love and Strife. Through a series of cycles without end the world went from a state in which Love dominated to a state in which Strife dominated and again from the state of Strife to the state of Love, and so on for ever. When Love dominated, all the four elements were mixed up together; when Strife dominated, each of the four formed a mass apart from the others. This might seem to be definitely spiritual agency, for Love and Strife belong to spirit and not to matter, yet Empedocles sometimes speaks as if they were a kind of fluid substance, two additional elements beside the four, showing that he had not arrived at conceiving something really immaterial.

His elder contemporary, another great Ionian, Anaxagoras (his expulsion from Athens was about 450 B.C.), came nearer still to conceiving a definitely spiritual reality behind the world. The famous sentence in his book said that 'when the matter of the world was all mixed up in confusion, Mind came and put it in order'—the order that we see. But Plato represents Socrates as being disappointed with the book of Anaxagoras because, although it introduced mind at the beginning of things, it made no further use of mind to explain why things were just what they were. And even Anaxagoras does not seem, by some of his language, to have got quite free from the conception of mind as a kind of matter. While in the stuff of the world, Anaxagoras said, opposites such as heat and cold, black and white, were mixed together (snow, for instance, contained minute particles of black), the characteristic of mind was that it was all of one quality, unmixed.

The speculations of a South Italian Greek, Parmenides (born c. 515 B.C.), had a great effect on later thought. Like his younger contemporary Empedocles he put his philosophy into a poem. The theory of Parmenides was that in reality the world consisted of one uniform mass

Poet, Prophet  
& Philosopher

without any distinctions between this part and that, and without any possibility of movement. If we saw round us a multiplicity of different things and saw bodies moving in space, that was all an illusion of the senses.

The school of Parmenides, called the Eleatic School (from the city of Elea in South Italy, to which Parmenides belonged), carried on his doctrine, especially his disciple Zeno (born c. 489 B.C.). Logical argument was in those days like a new discovery, with which people delighted to produce astonishing results. Zeno proved—or thought that he proved—that although you saw

**Intoxication of** motion everywhere,  
**Logical Argument** nevertheless if you once began to reason about

motion you were involved in all kinds of absurdities. One of his celebrated puzzles concerned Achilles and the tortoise: if Achilles and a tortoise were to race, and the tortoise had a start, Achilles could never draw level with it; for, by the time that Achilles had reached the tortoise's starting point, it would have advanced to a farther point; and by the time that Achilles had reached this point, the tortoise would have gone farther, and so on ad infinitum. Another was connected with the flight of an arrow through space. What this problem amounted to may be explained as follows: suppose that an arrow moves 50 yards in a second; it moves 1 yard in  $\frac{1}{50}$  of a second, one inch in  $\frac{1}{600}$  of a second, and so on, the extent of movement becoming smaller as the time becomes shorter. If then you carried on the process to infinity you would find that in an infinitely small time the arrow would not move at all. But if at every particular moment the arrow is at rest, how does any movement come about?

One effect of this use of logic to overthrow established belief was an unsettling of men's minds everywhere. In the later part of the fifth century the people called 'sophists' (professors of wisdom) were travelling about through the Greek cities, promising to make young men clever in debate. They were ready to show that all old ideas of right and wrong were absurd. The Eleatic philosophy had familiarised men with the idea that

all the appearances of the world might be a false illusion. And the philosophy of Democritus (c. 470–400 B.C.) also had a somewhat similar effect, whatever Democritus himself may have intended. For Democritus made a distinction between that which really was (as the Greek expressed it, was 'by nature')—the atoms and void; and that which was only 'by convention'—qualities of things such as 'sweetness' and 'heat'. This distinction between 'nature' and 'convention' the sophists could apply to right and wrong. The recognized difference between justice and injustice, for instance, the sophists could represent as a pure convention of society, without reality. It was of course mainly the young men who were carried away by these new ideas and showy tricks of argument. There was a danger of intellectual chaos throughout the rising generation.

Then it was that an Athenian came forward who was to make a new epoch in the thought of the world, and constitute Athens the chief seat of philosophy for nearly a thousand years. This man was Socrates, the son of Sophroniscus (470–399 B.C.). He made no claim himself to wisdom, but he was a philosopher in the sense **Socrates creates a new epoch** as few other men have ever loved it—a philosopher of a most unconventional kind. He had no school and never taught, like the sophists, for pay. But he spent his time—or all the time when he was not doing his duty to the state as soldier or magistrate—in going about among all sorts and conditions of men and asking them questions. He left no writings, and it must always be a matter of some doubt what positive teaching of his own he put forward. But he was a conspicuous personality in the Athens of his day, which he never quitted, except when sent out as a soldier on some expedition in the Peloponnesian War, and the strange stimulus he gave to the minds of men—like the electric shock given by the cuttle-fish, someone said—was such that from him, directly or indirectly, all the later schools of Greek philosophy were derived.

What we know of Socrates we know through the writings of his disciples,




#### HOMELY FEATURES OF THE WORLD'S FIRST MORAL PHILOSOPHER

The earliest portrait of Socrates that we possess, a statuette some eleven inches high in its present broken condition, was found at Alexandria and dates from the end of the fourth century B.C. It is therefore separated from his death (399) by nearly a century; but it is certainly a copy of an earlier and larger work, and in it we may rest assured that we have a faithful representation of the lovable, snub-nosed philosopher who actually walked the streets of Athens.

*British Museum*

chiefly those of his greatest disciple, Plato. In most of Plato's Dialogues Socrates is the chief speaker, and if this does not tell us what Socrates himself believed and taught—because we never can draw the line with any certainty between what Plato reported of the doctrine of his master and what Plato put into his mouth, ideas of his own or ideas derived from elsewhere—we can be sure at any rate that the personality, the manner, of the real Socrates was such as we see it in Plato's Dialogues. For the portrait there has such a strong individual character that it can never have been presented to a generation many of whom had known Socrates in life if it had not been true.

Both from what writers tell us, and from the ancient statues which remain, we know that Socrates was singularly ugly—a thick-set man with full lips, broad, flat nose and bulging eyes. He practised hardness in his own habits, went barefoot in the snow and showed a self-control which astonished the Greeks of his time, though,



FOUNDER OF THE CYNIC SCHOOL

A pupil who attended Socrates in his last moments, Antisthenes founded the Cynic school of philosophy that preached independence of the material comforts of life as being the only road to peace and happiness for mankind.

*By Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen*

mixing as he did in all society, he was capable of sitting at a banquet with young men and drinking with them all through the night; wine seemed to have no effect on him. One of the things which distinguished Socrates from previous philosophers was that—in mature life at any rate—he was little concerned with theories about the universe, what it was made of and how it came to be, but set, with all the curious strength of

his personality, upon discovering what was good and bad in human conduct. It was about this that he cross-examined every one—asking, for example, what justice really was, what temperance was, what courage was. As a later phrase said of him, he brought philosophy down from the sky to the earth.

The effect of his questioning was to involve the answerer in self-contradictions and show that the current ideas about these things were confused and unsatisfactory. He often made people look foolish, but yet they were arrested by his moral earnestness—a moral earnestness which went with a characteristic humour and playfulness. What was known as the Socratic 'eironeia' was not exactly 'irony' in our modern sense, but an engaging naïveté and humility which disclaimed any wisdom or knowledge for the questioner himself. When the Delphic oracle on one occasion described Socrates as the wisest of men, Socrates explained that he was wise only in knowing that he was ignorant, while other men were ignorant and thought that they knew.

Behind all his conduct and utterance there was an intense religious conviction. He believed that he had a mission assigned 'by God' and he believed that he sometimes felt an inner control, a divine voice, as it were, in his heart, which checked him when he was about to make a wrong decision. This was the 'daimonion' of Socrates, which was so much discussed in later ages, for 'daimon' in the Greek of that time did not mean a 'demon' in our sense, but any unseen superhuman power, whether good or bad.

In the end Socrates was put to death by sentence of an Athenian law-court on the charge that he was introducing new

Search for laws  
of Human Conduct

divinities and corrupting the morals of young men (399 B.C.). This great crime of the Athenian democracy can be understood only by reference to the political circumstances of the time. The trial was just after a group of the nobles had seized the power in the state by violence and suppressed the democracy, and the democratic party had fought and overthrown them and re-established the old constitution. Some of the nobles had been, as young men, associates of Socrates, and the restored democracy, in a suspicious and angry mood, saw in Socrates one of its enemies. The motive of the crime was political rather than religious.

The words and personality of Socrates had given so strong an impulse to a number of other minds that, when he was dead, several of those who had listened to him became founders of diverse systems of philosophy, developed on their own lines. Two of the schools which owed their inception to the stimulating influence of Socrates were the Cynic school and the Cyrenaic school. 'Cynic' in Greek means 'doggish' and the members of this group were commonly called 'dogs' ('kynes'); the founder was Antisthenes (c. 440-370 B.C.). What had most impressed him about Socrates was his independence of material amenities and comforts. Most men were unhappy, the Cynics maintained, because they depended upon things which they often could not get—good food, good clothes, etc.—and because they were in bondage to all sorts of social conventions. Men would be happy and free if they gave up all these superfluities and reduced life to the extreme of simplicity, to the nearest approach to the life of animals, of 'dogs.'

Like dogs, the followers of Antisthenes had no house, but slept in the temple porticoes, or in winter perhaps in the public bath-houses; lived on scraps which any one could pick up, and refused to be bothered by considerations of decency in the performance of any natural function. They also made it a great part of their business to preach in streets and market-places to the multitude, who were still in bondage, declaring the way of freedom and holding all the common vices of



**DIOGENES THE SURLY**

Whether Diogenes of Sinope, the famous pupil of Antisthenes who carried his master's theory to even greater lengths, ever actually dwelt in an earthenware jar is doubtful; but the story well accords with the figure here portrayed.

*British Museum*

men up to contempt with a brutal plainness of speech. The most famous disciple of Antisthenes was Diogenes of Sinope (c. 412-323 B.C.), who is said to have lived, not as popular tradition has it in a tub, but in one of those huge earthenware jars which were used in ancient Greece for storing water or oil or grain.

The Cyrenaic school seemed the opposite of the Cynic, because it declared that the one reasonable thing to aim at in all action was pleasure. It was called Cyrenaic after its founder, Aristippus of Cyrene (the dates of his birth and death are unknown; he was in Athens before 399 and still alive in 366). Really the two schools had a great deal in common. Both aimed at making men independent of fortune, but Aristippus taught that this could be achieved if the individual got out of every moment, when it was there, the full amount of pleasure it could be made to yield, and yet never allowed himself to become so dependent upon




anything as to mind if it were taken away from him. 'Enjoy thoroughly what is there, and do not be bothered about the morrow,' was his gospel. If a rich man puts splendid clothes and rich food and women at your disposal, enjoy them; but if his mood changes and he turns you out of doors, be quite happy till some fresh opportunity of enjoyment occurs. Live in the present. The proper way to play the game with Fortune is to take all she offers, but never let yourself fall into her power. Few people, however, would have disapproved of the views of Aristippus more strongly than Socrates.

The greatest of the disciples of Socrates was also one of the greatest philosophers of the world: Plato (born 427 B.C.). Like Socrates, Plato was an Athenian; unlike Socrates, he was connected by blood with the great aristocratic families of Athens. As many another young man of

that class, Plato had been drawn to one who was not only so delightful a companion to young men, but who had that strange faculty of quickening spiritual life. Some years after his master's death, Plato set up a school of philosophic studies in the neighbourhood of Athens, near a beautiful grove dedicated to a mythical hero called Academus. For this reason the school founded by Plato was later known as the 'Academy' (Akademeia). There he presided over a society of disciples until his death in 347-6, at the age of 81. The society he founded, with funds of its own, lasted for nearly nine centuries, till the pagan schools were abolished by the Emperor Justinian (A.D. 529).

Plato is the first Greek philosopher whose written works have come down to us in more than fragments; his we have apparently complete—that series of Dialogues which remain, and will remain,

one of the greatest achievements in the literature of mankind. Yet, curiously, we find Plato himself saying, in a letter which is probably authentic, that he had never put forth in writing a statement of his philosophy. This must mean that his systematic teaching was given by word of mouth in the Academy to his disciples. In his Dialogues he does not speak himself—unless perhaps he is the 'Athenian Stranger' in the *Laws*. He takes up certain questions and lets discussion in an imaginary conversation play round them, showing their bearings and their implications, putting tentative solutions of them into the mouth of someone else, generally of Socrates. No doubt the Dialogues do give us most of the leading ideas of Plato himself, and out of them a great deal of his system of thought can be reconstructed. But Plato does not make it a coherent system for us himself, and the Dialogues do not contain the whole of his teaching as it was given



THE GREATEST PHILOSOPHER OF ALL TIME

Far greater than Antisthenes or Diogenes, who seized and elaborated non-essential elements in the character of Socrates, was Plato the Athenian, an imaginative poet as much as a philosopher, whose writings come down to us in the immortal prose of the Dialogues. He has influenced all subsequent thought.

Vatican Museum; photo, Alinari

in discourse to his disciples. This is proved by references in Aristotle, who had been a member of the Academy, and knew, if anyone did, what was taught there.

It is not only the unsystematic way in which Plato's philosophy is presented to us that makes it hard to give an account of it. The difficulty also comes from the interplay of different kinds of interest in Plato's genius. He was more than a philosopher who had an intellectual interest of extraordinary intensity; he was also essentially an imaginative poet, with a strong and humorous dramatic gift, a master of literary form, and above all a man with a mystical religious craving which sought a satisfaction that was far more than merely intellectual. Any cut-and-dried account of Plato's theories can therefore never explain what the writings of Plato mean for those who make acquaintance with Plato himself, as his rich and vivid genius lives in the books he wrote.

Probably the mystical craving was the deepest motive in Plato's philosophy—a craving which in him did seek its satisfaction largely in a system of intellectual concepts, even if it reached beyond the intellect. The thing which drove him to look for stable intellectual concepts with such earnestness was just a need of the soul to find something stable on which it could rest, in the midst of a world of change and passing away. This horror of change, of manifold confusion, of unrest—things which seem essential characteristics of the world apprehended by our senses—is the mark of the mystical temperament which seeks to fly from the many to the one, from the transient to the eternal, from change to changelessness. Plato, because of his vivid intellectual interest, felt the horror of change, especially with regard to the desire to know. We could not really know things which were always



A PHILOSOPHER'S TREE-SHADED RETREAT

Philosophic schools at Athens derived their names from the places where their founders taught: Plato's Academy from the grove of Academus, Aristotle's Lyceum from the gymnasium of Apollo Lyceus, Zeno's stoicism from the Stoa Poikile or Painted Porch. This mosaic from Pompeii has been thought by some to represent Plato teaching in his Academy.

National Museum, Naples; photo, Alinari

changing and becoming something else, like the objects of our sense-experience. They slipped away in the midst of our attempt to grasp them. And here help seemed to come from geometry. For in geometry we could acquire knowledge about the properties of figures which was absolutely firm and stable, and quite independent of the imperfections of any figure we might draw on paper or sand. The circle of which geometry spoke, when it said such and such things were true of the circle, was not any such visible circle—for no visible circle was an absolutely perfect circle—it was the ideal circle. And yet the ideal circle did not belong to a world of merely human imagination. For the things which geometry said were true of 'the Circle' really were true, whether men apprehended them or not.

The word which Plato (perhaps following the Pythagoreans) applied to this perfect circle which was not to be seen anywhere in our world, and to other similar

elements, was 'idea' (or 'eidos'), which meant 'shape' or 'figure.' But the word was also used in the sense of 'sort' or 'kind.' In this sense the ideal Circle stood for a whole class of things, circles. All the visible specimens of the class were imperfect, approximations more or less to the class type, the perfect circle, which was unseen. Well, then, if here in geometry there was a possibility of stable knowledge, in spite of the variability of things seen and

**Meaning of** handled, it seemed to Plato  
**Plato's 'Ideas'** that, by laying hold on the  
idea, real knowledge in other  
fields could be gained in the same way. There must be an 'idea' of Man, to which all men in our world approximated more or less nearly; there must be an 'idea' of Justice to which our conceptions of justice approximated.

This was the famous Platonic doctrine of ideas. And it is important to grasp that idea means here something quite different from what we understand by the word 'idea' in our ordinary speech to-day. For we use the word 'idea' to mean something which exists only in the human mind, but Plato used the word to mean that which had real existence apart from the human mind. On the question whether every class of things in the world had an idea 'in heaven,' Plato seems to have shifted in his view. Sometimes he says that manufactured articles, like tables and beds, have ideas; sometimes that only natural growths have ideas. We cannot understand what the doctrine meant for Plato if we think of it only as a theory intended to solve an intellectual difficulty. To turn from the confusions and instability of the world we see to these transcendent ideas, always the same, always perfect, was an ecstatic religious joy, a rest of the spirit bewildered amongst the dark multiplicity of things.

The world of the ideas was spiritual, not material. With Plato at last Greek thought has arrived at a clear distinction between spiritual and material existence. But if Man could rise in thought from this transient world of the senses to that world which abides eternally there must be in Man, too, something immortal. And here Plato was no doubt influenced by the

Orphic idea of the soul as a divine being imprisoned temporarily in a body. Plato held earnestly that each man's soul had existed before his birth, sometimes in the unseen world, sometimes in other bodies, of men or animals, in this world, and that after death it will go on existing through a series of lives to come. He explained the fact that people, if questioned, often seem to have knowledge stored in their minds which has never been brought clearly into their consciousness, by supposing that men's attaining of knowledge was really a recovery of knowledge, a recollection of what their souls had known long before, when, disembodied, they had contemplated the ideas. We may notice that Wordsworth has used this Platonic doctrine in his great Ode on the Intimations of Immortality.

With his belief in the immortality of the soul Plato coupled a conviction that according as men lived righteously or unrighteously, purely or sensually, they would be happy or miserable in the world beyond death. He knew that no accurate picture could be formed in Man's mind regarding the nature of that world, and so he puts into the mouth of Socrates 'myths,' imaginary  
**Plato's beliefs**  
descriptions of what the **on After-life**  
soul would find when it left the body, descriptions of the torments inflicted there upon those who had been great and successful sinners in this world; not as accounts literally true, but as giving what Plato believed the character of that world truly to be. Plato, as was pointed out at the beginning, was an imaginative poet as well as a thinker.


These beliefs gave to Plato's philosophy an intense moral earnestness. He hated injustice and sensuality, all that made men's life disorderly and unstable and unclean. He hated the old stories which attributed wickedness and sensuality to the gods and the heroes of old time; he was sure that God cared for righteousness and would not favour the wicked for any gifts and prayers the wicked might offer. Hence it was not enough for him that the reality behind the variable world should be eternal and changeless; it must be good as well. The supreme idea of all, that from which all other ideas, and hence

all things in the world, drew their being was the Idea of Good. The only satisfactory reason for the existence of anything in the world, or of the world as a whole, was that it was *best* that it should be. In his last long book, the *Laws*, written when he was old, his 'Athenian Stranger' argues with passion that all the processes of the world must have a spiritual origin. Mechanical movement, he says, can never start itself; the only thing which can start movement is soul. In an earlier work, the *Timaeus*, where he had described the dependence of the world upon God by a 'myth' describing how the world began, he says that God made the world because He was good and generous, and so desired to call into being something like Himself.

Some of Plato's writing deals with the best form for a Greek city state, since the whole life of the Greeks was so essentially conditioned by their city states that it would have been impossible at that time to draw a pattern for the conduct of the individual without considering the pattern for the state. Plato disliked democracy;

he had seen it at Athens, and it meant for him the things he hated—agitation, disorder, noisy ignorance, indefinite variability, the killing of Socrates. He disliked still more the rule of the lawless despot. His ideal was a state remote from the demoralising influences of commerce, in which an established order worked generation after generation, with a regularity like that of the stars, in which the citizens were distributed in fixed classes according to function, and an aristocracy of the wisest ruled—all clear and clean and beautiful and restfully changeless.

Eleven years after Plato's death one of his disciples, who for twenty years had been a student at the Academy, set up a rival school at Athens in a gymnasium called the Lyceum (after Apollo Lyceus, to whom it was dedicated). This man was Aristotle (384 to 322 B.C.). He was an alien in Athens, being a citizen of Stagirus on the confines of Macedonia, and in the interval after Plato's death he had been engaged by the Macedonian king as tutor to his son, afterwards known as Alexander



#### LOGICIAN AND BIOLOGIST: THE GREAT FOUNDER OF THE LYCEUM

Aristotle, first a pupil of Plato and then the founder of a rival school, was different in many ways from his older contemporary whose preoccupations had been mathematics and astronomy on the physical side and the human soul on the ethical. Though Aristotle too occupied himself with the human soul, he is pedestrian beside Plato, and mathematics he neglected; his great contributions were in the realm of biology, for which his unrivalled powers of observation particularly suited him.

*Hof Museum, Vienna; from Delbrück, 'Antike Porträts'*

the Great. Since the part of the gymnasium where Aristotle taught was a kind of covered colonnade called a 'peripatos' (walk), those who afterwards followed Aristotle's philosophy were called Peripatetics. Aristotle always professed a great personal regard for his master, Plato, but in many ways he came to disagree with him and seems

**Aristotle and the Peripatetics** in his writings to seize opportunities of picking Plato to pieces. Plato and

Aristotle indeed were of very different casts of mind; someone has said, a later philosophic thinker, that every man is born either a Platonist or an Aristotelian. Both philosophers had a great part in shaping Christian thought. At first the influence of Plato was predominant, but in the thirteenth century Aristotle became 'the Philosopher' for the Christian 'Schoolmen' whose philosophy is still the official philosophy of the Roman Church.

Aristotle was a drier, less poetic nature than his master. His view of the world was less marked by flashes of genius than by immense industry in collecting and classifying facts of all kinds. Plato's strong point had been mathematics, of which Aristotle had but a weak grasp; Aristotle's strong point was biology, in which Plato had indulged his fancy. For Plato all philosophy had appeared as one: all sciences, if philosophy knew its business, could be deduced from the Idea of Good. Aristotle divided philosophy into a number of independent branches. The first great division was between 'theoretical' and 'practical' philosophy—between the philosophy which studied things as they were with the simple purpose of recognizing them, and the philosophy which studied such things as human will can change and shape, with the purpose of fashioning them rightly.

Theoretical philosophy had three subdivisions: 'first philosophy,' which inquired into the ultimate ground of the universe, what 'being' meant, what God was; mathematics, which inquired into being so far as it was determined by number and geometrical form; and physics, which studied such objects as were material and capable of motion. Practical

philosophy for Aristotle meant mainly 'politics,' that is, the study of the right conduct of man in society. 'Ethics,' the theory of individual conduct, was for him only a branch of 'politics.' But besides thus dividing up philosophy according to its subject matter, Aristotle devoted a number of works to the study of the processes of reasoning and proof which were used by the mind as an 'instrument' in all branches of philosophy—to what to-day we call logic.

Aristotle's works on logic were included as a whole under the name *Organon* ('Instrument'). What the text-books up to modern times know as *Formal Logic* is simply the Aristotelian logic, modified and extended in some ways during Roman times or in the Middle Ages. The establishment of the syllogism as the perfect type of reasoning goes back to Aristotle. 'All men are mortal' (major premiss); 'Socrates is a man' (minor premiss); 'Therefore Socrates is mortal' (conclusion)—is the stock example of the syllogism. It is not,

of course, a fact that **Examples of** people arrive by this **Aristotelian logic** process at the discovery of new truth, for if we are still uncertain whether Socrates is mortal or not we cannot make the affirmation of the major premiss, that all men are mortal. The syllogism only shows us what we have to do in order to prove something. From the fact that Socrates is a man we cannot conclusively prove that Socrates is mortal, unless we are prepared to show that humanity goes necessarily by its very constitution with mortality. Men habitually argue in common life that because two things have been found in *some* cases to go together, they must go together in the particular case under discussion. The syllogism warns us that such reasoning is quite inconclusive.

In his general theory of knowledge Aristotle did not depart so far from Plato as might appear from his criticisms of Platonism. For Aristotle, too, real knowledge is knowledge of 'universals,' not of the particular things we can see and handle, and the ultimate principles of the several sciences which cannot be proved by deduction from anything else are ap-

prehended by the mind in direct intuition, apart from sense-perception.

With regard to 'first philosophy'—which in later time got the name of metaphysics, because the books of Aristotle which dealt with it came in the school arrangement of his writings after *The Physics* ('*meta ta physika*')—Aristotle's theory of the world is built on two contrasts which occur over and over again in his writings—the contrast between matter and form, and the contrast between potentiality ('power') and actuality ('energy'). Matter or 'hyle'—that is, literally, 'wood,' 'ship-timber'—does not mean matter in the sense given to the word by modern science: it means the stuff of any particular thing in contrast to the sum of properties which give it its specific character, and for which Aristotle used the word '*eidos*,' form, the same word which

**Matter and Form:** Plato had used for his  
**Power and Energy** ideas. For instance, a bowl and a trumpet may have the same 'matter,' copper, but the different 'form' makes one a bowl and the other a trumpet; an ox and a horse have the same 'matter,' flesh, bones, etc., but a different 'form' which makes one an ox and the other a horse. Of course, copper, to go farther back, has a form of its own in contrast to the matter which it has in common with other metals, and Aristotle holds that we can never get back to pure matter without any form at all. Such a thing does not exist.

The parallel contrast between potentiality and actuality is drawn from the process of vital development going on all round us in nature—the acorn potentially an oak becoming an oak in actuality when the form of the oak tree has been imposed upon the vegetable matter. In Aristotle there was, for all his determination to be sober and prosaic, a strain of mysticism, which made him see things everywhere striving, as it were, after a perfection they do not at the beginning possess, after the actuality, the realized form; and made him speak of nature as if she were a purposive power, 'doing nothing aimlessly,' working to realize each form, though her intention might be more or less frustrated by the incapacity of the

matter to receive the form in its perfection. The process by which things moved from potentiality to actuality Aristotle called 'motion,' the term covering with him much more than the movement of a body in space. That which set a process going he called the 'efficient cause'—the father, for instance, in the production of any individual of an animal species, the father himself having been produced by a similar efficient cause farther back. And these processes, he held, had been going on from eternity: the world had no beginning and would have no end. The problem, 'Which came first, the first hen or the first egg?' did not arise, Aristotle would have said, because there had never been a first hen nor a first egg: the series of hens and eggs extended backwards to infinity.

**Aristotle's views  
on Nature**

Aristotle's inquiry into the shape and arrangement of the universe belonged to 'physics,' and we will glance at that before we touch on that part of 'first philosophy' which dealt with God. With regard to astronomy and to physics, Aristotle marks a step backward from Plato. Plato had taught that the earth moved, and that it was not at the centre of the universe; he had also taught that the traditional four elements were not to be regarded as forms of matter incapable of further analysis. Aristotle put the earth once more unmoving at the centre, and he held that the analysis of matter must stop at the four elements. The earth was surrounded by a number of concentric moving spheres, the sphere of the moon nearest to the earth, the sphere of the fixed stars outermost. The movement of the world as a whole was derived from the movement of the outermost sphere, which was therefore called the *Primum Mobile*, the 'First Moved.' Aristotle's astronomical scheme remained dominant for later antiquity and for the Middle Ages, with certain modifications in detail (see illustrations in pages 48 and 1482). The false theories established by his authority were thus the great hindrance to any advance in astronomical science till the days of Copernicus.

We now return to 'first philosophy' to learn Aristotle's explanation what it was that caused the 'First Moved' to

move. This was God, who was pure actuality, form without any matter at all. But Aristotle strongly insisted (against Plato) that it was unnecessary for the cause which moved something else to move itself. God was the unmoved Mover. And God did not move the world by any act of his will. It was far beneath his dignity to take any account of the world, which was material. The only thing worthy to engage God's activity was mind, and so his activity consisted solely in 'thinking about thinking.' The world moved because God, without his will, had an extraordinary attraction for it. The world was drawn after him, in Aristotle's famous phrase, as the lover is drawn after the beloved. Not 'God so loved the world' but 'the world so loved God.' In this strange transcendental dream the philosophy of the man who set out to be matter-of-fact culminated!

In Aristotle's theory of the human soul also he makes at the end an odd leap into mysticism. After his argument has apparently gone to show that the soul is nothing but the full development of the vital functions of the organism, so that the soul would seemingly be inseparable from the body, he suddenly throws in some dark words about an intelligence which is separate from matter, imperishable, engaged eternally in thinking, and says that thought in a human individual could not go on at all apart from this mysterious 'active intelligence.'

Aristotle's great contributions to knowledge were in logic and biology, though even in biology on one important point

**Aristotle and the City State** Plato had been right and Aristotle went wrong (the connexion of the brain with thought).

In politics Aristotle's interest centred on the city state of the Greeks. Though he saw Alexander's vast empire come into being, the horizon of his political thinking remained that of a state small enough 'for the whole citizen body when assembled to hear the voice of one herald.' In his theory of individual conduct, after surveying with many shrewd observations the way in which men act and the moral judgements that they pass, he again ends up in mysticism. The highest activities of men, he says, are not in the moral sphere, but in the in-

tellectual. It would be absurd to think of the gods as moral; and in the detached contemplation of truth and beauty Man enters, so far as it is possible to do under human conditions, into a life more than human, the life of God.

Aristotle lived, as has just been said, to see the astounding transformation of the Nearer East brought about by the conquests (333-323 B.C.) of his former pupil, Alexander the Great. After this all the countries which had been subject to the Persian king, as far as India, became subject to the kings of Greek culture. **Philosophy after Aristotle**

To Greek enterprise these countries were now thrown open and Greek cities began to come into being at all the critical points of communication over Syria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and Persia. The people of the old Greek cities were attracted in masses to these new foundations, or to the Hellenistic courts of Asia and Egypt. Drawn away from the tradition of their old communities, excited with indefinite prospects of power and gain, the men of the Greek world began to lose their moral bearings, to plunge into egoistic adventure and to feel that the only power ruling human affairs was incalculable luck. In such a state of things there came to be a much more general need for a guide of life, a clear doctrine regarding that which it was good for the children of men to pursue all their days under the sun. Philosophy had to become more practical and popular, to go out from the schools into the market place. The schools of Plato and Aristotle still continued at Athens, but new philosophies, with a predominantly practical purpose, began to attract men in the world at large.

The new philosophy of largest influence was that of the Stoics. It had its name from the Painted 'Porch' (Stoa, that is 'colonnade') at Athens where its founder had taught. He was a Phoenician Cypriote called Zeno (c. 340-264 B.C.—see page 1334), to be distinguished from Zeno of Elea; his teaching was developed by his successors at Athens—Cleanthes (c. 300-220 B.C.), a Greek from Asia Minor, and Chrysippus (280-207 B.C.), a Cilician Greek. The object of the Stoic philosophy was to give men deliverance from the fears and the

desires which made the majority of them miserable, and it claimed to do this by showing that the only real good was completely within the reach of anyone who willed to have it; because the only real good was a good will, and that good it was within anyone's power to have, if he would. So long as our happiness depended on anything outside ourselves, over which we had no control, we were bound to experience anxiety and restless craving and disappointment, but if our happiness was within ourselves, we were absolutely independent of outside circumstances. Chance could not touch us. All the circumstances outside our own control, all that happened to us, were things ordained by God—by Zeus, the Stoics habitually said, using for God the traditional name of the chief god of the Greeks—and the Stoic wise man so identified his own will with the will of God that nothing which happened to him, however painful, was contrary to what he chose himself. Some famous lines of Cleanthes expressed this attitude:

Lead me, O Zeus, and thou, O Destiny,  
Whither ordained is by your decree:  
I'll follow, doubting not—or if with will  
Recreant I falter, I must follow still.


But in order that a man might so joyfully accept the course of things, the Stoics taught that the God who governed the universe was perfect Reason. In fact, they said that the universe was God. And God was a material substance; for the Stoics went back from the Platonic apprehension of an immaterial spiritual mode of being and maintained that nothing which was not material 'body' existed. Only, unlike modern materi-

alists, they endowed God's material substance with the properties of spirit. God, they said, in his proper being was a kind of fiery gas—fire, aether, breath—but this fire was conscious, was pure Reason. The universe passed continually backwards and forwards from one condition to another. Sometimes the Divine Fire, God, existed

alone; then part of the Divine Fire became condensed and turned into passive matter—air, water, earth—and a world such as that we live in came about. But part of the Divine Fire remained as a kind of envelope all round the world, and pervaded the matter of the world, directing the whole course of the world according to the divine plan. So that when you spoke of destiny or providence or nature, these were only other names for God. The reason in each individual man was a little particle of the Divine Fire. After the world had run its ordained

course, it was all burnt up again in the Divine Fire, and God was once more alone. Then, after a time, a new world was formed and ran its course and was absorbed again into the Divine Fire—and so on for ever.

The views of the Stoics were thus essentially religious, though they differed so much from the popular polytheism. But the Stoics were very anxious not to break with the popular religion. They therefore explained all the traditional mythology about the multitude of gods as allegories of the truth, and were ready on that ground to justify even the crude obscenities of Greek paganism against which Plato and his followers vigorously protested. It is unquestionable that, although many preachers of Stoicism were



RESOLVER OF MAN'S FEARS

Unlike the Stoics, who thought that Man could attain happiness only by cheerful submission to the will of God, Epicurus sought to banish fear by disproving supernatural interference in the world and denying a future life.

*Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen*



impostors, Stoicism produced through the succeeding centuries some men of impressive goodness and moral strength. For us to-day the greatest exponents of Stoicism are the ex-slave Epictetus (a younger contemporary of S. Paul) and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius.

The school of Epicurus (341-270 B.C.) was in many ways diametrically opposed to the Stoics. Epicurus was an Athenian; his philosophy is often termed the philosophy of 'the Garden,' in contrast to the philosophy of 'the Porch,' because it was in a garden at Athens that Epicurus mainly lived and taught. He, too, aimed at delivering men from vain fear and desire, but he took a different way. We should ask, he said, what really constitutes happiness; and he found it in a level, untroubled cheerfulness. Pleasure, or at any rate the absence of its opposite, pain, was the one thing that mattered; and that was easily secured if people would only limit their desires to simple tranquil enjoyments. Men were made miserable unnecessarily by following vainglorious ambitions and violent sensual pleasures, which brought in the end more discomfort than happiness.

Two great fears, it seemed to Epicurus, were fear of the gods, whose anger was supposed to be revealed in thunder and natural catastrophes, and fear of what would happen to the soul after death. The gospel of Epicurus was that no part of the process of nature, nothing which happened in the world, was caused by divine superhuman beings. Everything, our souls included, was a chance conglomeration of atoms. There were an infinite number of atoms rushing always 'downwards' through infinite space, colliding and rebounding, and so forming an infinite number of worlds, each of which lasted only for a time, till it was destroyed again by the rush of the atom-stream, and so on through infinite time. And as for fears of what came after death, nothing came; for the soul, being composed of atoms, was dissipated 'like smoke.'

Yet Epicurus taught that gods existed in the empty spaces between the worlds, perfectly beautiful and happy beings, in a form like the human, and talking Greek.

Only their life of bliss was free from any concern for the world; they did nothing in the world and prayers could not reach them; but the images of their loveliness could float down to men in dreams, and men could adore them in aesthetic contemplation, pure admiration, without any thought of punishment or reward. Epicureanism had never the same kind of popularity as Stoicism. Yet many men in the upper rank of society in the Graeco-Roman world of the last century B.C. were Epicureans—Julius Caesar, it is said, amongst them. The great exposition of Epicureanism for us is the noble poem of the Roman Lucretius (a contemporary of Caesar). Tennyson's poem 'Lucretius' may give English readers an idea of this Roman Epicureanism.

Both Stoicism and Epicureanism were dogmatic philosophies, but there were also philosophers called Sceptics, who denied that anything could be known at all of what lay outside the range of the senses. Pyrrho of Elis (360-270 B.C.?) was regarded as the first Sceptic teacher, hence Pyrrhonism is sometimes used as an equivalent to Scepticism. The Sceptics were concerned to question, not to establish anything positive nor to deny. They tried to show that whatever argument might be brought forward to prove or disprove any dogma, there were always just as strong arguments on the other side. The wise man, therefore, they said, would never commit himself to any opinion about anything except what he actually saw and felt. As his rule of life he would just follow the usages of society—perform the usual acts of homage to the gods without any opinion whether there were any gods or not, observe the established code of conduct, without any opinion whether it was good or not. Scepticism never had the vogue of the dogmatic philosophies, though a man like Cicero sometimes inclined to it. Some of its arguments were important when Paganism had to defend itself against Christianity. When the Christians argued that Pagan religious beliefs were absurd, the Sceptic could reply that since no knowledge of these things was possible, it was best for men to do as their ancestors had done.

# THE GREEKS AND SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY

What they had achieved by daring Speculation  
and Experiment down to the Alexandrine Age

By CHARLES SINGER M.D. D.Litt.

Lecturer in the History of Medicine in the University of London; Author of Greek Biology and Greek Medicine, etc.

THE science of antiquity is Greek science. It is true that the Greeks, like all other peoples that have ever been, drew upon their predecessors for some of their knowledge and some of their ideas. It is true that modern research has shown that the civilizations of Mesopotamia, of Egypt, of Persia, of the Minoan world were all of them ancestors of the Hellenic civilization. It is true that mathematics, astronomy, medicine were all cultivated in those ancient empires, and it is also true that the mathematics, the astronomy and the medicine of the Greeks owe a debt to Mesopotamia, to Egypt, to Persia and to Crete. Yet the Greek intellect made a difference in these departments of knowledge which utterly transformed them.

The tribes of Greeks, scattered along the isles and coasts of the Mediterranean and united more than they were divided by its waves, had garnered a thrice gleaned field, and lo! there is something that before was not. To explain the transformation would be to explain genius. The magic of Greece has been at work and science has come into being.

In the more ancient Oriental civilizations knowledge was collected for practical ends. Men needed to measure their land, to ascertain the exact date for sowing and reaping, to placate their gods, to divide time, to treat disease, to avoid bewitchment, to meet the thousand adventures of daily life. Knowledge may advance far for such reasons as these, but can never truly become science. Science, as its name implies, is knowledge ('scientia'), and knowledge pure and simple; knowledge, without qualification or adjective; knowledge acquired for its own sake.

Science is doubtless something else besides this, but knowledge of this sort it certainly is. For men to accumulate knowledge thus they must be convinced—as the Greeks were convinced and the men of the great Oriental empires were not convinced—that such knowledge has a reality outside their own minds. They must be satisfied, in fact, that order reigns in nature. Until the mind can come to rest in this faith there can be no science. In science, as in another sphere, faith answereth all things.

Why did the Greeks believe so fervently that order reigns in nature? The question is difficult, and if it can be answered it is for the historian of philosophy rather than for the historian of science to furnish the reply. Yet it is right to point out here that, while Greek search for we in our day distinguish order in Nature between science and philosophy, the Greek did so but seldom. The Greek thinker, the early Greek thinker at least, had the universe as a whole in his mind. If he separated a part of it for mathematical, for zoological, for astronomical, for physical, for botanical, for psychological investigation, he did so with the lurking hope that his investigations would throw light on the whole of reality as a whole.

In our day it is quite otherwise. With us a man, according to his capacities, his tastes or his opportunities, deliberately decides to be a mathematician, a zoologist, an astronomer, a physicist, a botanist or a psychologist. The difference of approach rightly understood will give us insight into Greek science in both its strength and its weakness. Let us glance for a moment at both strength and weakness.

If the modern man of science is liable to degenerate into a mere pedant who cannot see the wood for the trees, the Greek man of science was equally liable to lose himself in a fog of speculation in which the wood became hazy and the trees indistinguishable. Among modern men who occupy themselves with science are many whose lives are wasted in ill directed observations from which no general ideas of any value emerge. Among Greeks who occupied themselves with science were many who squandered their powers by their eagerness and haste in grasping ill grounded general ideas. Nevertheless, among the Greeks were men of clear vision and determined will who missed neither the wood nor the trees, and it is such men who will chiefly concern us. Seeing the wood clearly was, perhaps, the strong point of Greek men of science, as missing it is, perhaps, the weak point of modern men of science.

The origins of science among the Greeks were not in the land we now call Greece,

but in certain outlying districts. The main impact of the Hellenic immigration had fallen

upon the Greek peninsula itself, but streams of invading tribes passed by the sea coast and the islands to western Asia Minor, and the subsequent development of these colonists, as we have seen in Chapter 34, was of the utmost importance for the history of Greek thought. Chief among these Asiatic Greeks were the Ionians, who colonised the shores from Ephesus in the north to Halicarnassus in the south. Yet farther south settled the Dorians. It was among the Ionians that the first great intellectual impulse of a scientific character arose. Dorian elements also crept in at an early date.

The Greeks settled in Ionia were favourably placed for the reception of foreign ideas. Towards the East they were in relation with the ancient Mesopotamian culture. Later the conquests and activities of Persia brought them in contact with the most vigorous power of the age. Their regular sea traffic with Egypt conveyed to them suggestions from the most ancient and settled of all civilizations. Moreover, the traditions of the

Minoan people, whom the Ionians had themselves displaced, lingered on and had their influence upon their minds.

In this conflict of elements arose the first organized thought which we can distinguish as science. We discern science in recognizable form emerging into the light of historic day in the person of the Ionic Thales, who lived at Miletus on the western shores of Asia Minor from about 624 to about 545 B.C.

Tradition tells that this Thales was a man of great astuteness which he exhibited no less in political and commercial matters than in his manner of thinking about the world around him. He suggested a system of federal government for the cities of Ionia and as a salt merchant he made a fortune, which he increased by cornering the olive market. In the course of his business he visited Mesopotamia and Egypt; and it was in Mesopotamia that he learned of the so-called Saronic cycle, that is, the interval of eighteen years and eleven days which the observations of ages by the Babylonian temple stargazers had shown to be a not unusual interval between eclipses of the sun.

This knowledge enabled the shrewd traveller to forecast an eclipse visible at his native Miletus on May 28, 585 B.C. His prediction drew a great deal of attention. It may well have been the impression thus created that directed the Greeks to the intellectual advantages that might accrue from systematic observation of nature. At any rate, they always respected Thales as the father of that study.

The further achievements of Thales were chiefly in the department of geometry. Now it is important here to recall that the Greeks did not invent geometry; they could and did gather some knowledge of the subject from their neighbours in the Nile valley. The Egyptians, however, had attained only to an empirical knowledge of certain special relations of figures and especially of triangles and rectangles. Thus, for instance, the Egyptians knew that the square on the longest side of a right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares on the other two sides; but they knew it only for the special case in which the sides are in the ratio 3, 4

Greek debt  
to the Orient

and 5: thus  $5 \times 5 = 3 \times 3 + 4 \times 4$  (see diagram adjoining).

Such knowledge of special cases Thales succeeded in generalising, and thereby became the father of abstract geometry. Thus he discovered that a circle is bisected by its diameter, that the angles at the base of an isosceles triangle are equal, that when two straight lines cut one another the opposite angles are equal, that the angle on the circumference of a circle subtended by the diameter is always a right angle, that the sum of the angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles, and that the sides of triangles with equal angles are proportional.

Thales, moreover, succeeded in applying such knowledge to practical matters. He was able, for instance, to determine the distance from the shore of a ship at sea, and to measure the height of a pyramid by comparing the length of the shadow it cast with the length of the shadow cast by an object of known height.


As with all the Ionian thinkers, the object of the thought of Thales was to find a formula for all things. This is but to say that his science was a part of his philosophy. His real place in the history of science is brought out by the statement that in his mathematical work we have the first enunciation of natural laws, that is to say, expressions of a fixed dependence between different quantities. This may be otherwise described by saying that he, first of all men known to us, formally set himself the task of discerning constancy amidst the diversity and variety of nature. Thales is, therefore, the father of science.

It would be a complex task to set forth the whole intellectual history of the

**The earlier Ionian school** The Ionian Greeks during the sixth and following centuries. For the most part their activity had a philosophical direction.

The work of such men as Anaximander, Anaximenes, Leucippus, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras and Democritus (the last three mentioned are also considered as philosophers in the preceding chapter), certainly comes under that heading. Nevertheless, all these Ionian thinkers contributed to the extension of the conception of natural law.

The general direction of thought started by Thales was continued by his pupil, Anaximander of Miletus (611-547 B.C.). He took much interest in geography, and to him is ascribed the first attempt among the Greeks to represent the details of the surface of the earth by the use of maps. It seems probable that this idea of map-



#### GREEK QUEST FOR THE UNIVERSAL

The Egyptians knew that the square on the base of a right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares on the other two sides when the sides are in the proportion 3:4:5, as shown above. It fell to the Greeks to apply the law to all right-angled triangles.

making was borrowed from Egypt. Anaximander, moreover, endeavoured also to convey a concrete picture of the universe. The idea of this he derived perhaps from Mesopotamia, for a diagram of Babylonian origin, making a similar attempt, has survived (see page 974). He was thus led to astronomical conceptions and taught the obliquity of the ecliptic, that is of the circle of the celestial sphere which is the apparent path of the sun. Anaximander introduced the sun-dial from Babylonia. He also introduced among the Greeks the use of the gnomon, a fixed upright rod of which the length and direction of the shadow can be measured day by day, and the movements of the sun as well as the solstices, or the shortest and longest days, thus determined.

The successor of Anaximander, Anaximenes, also of Miletus, extended his pre-

decessor's work, especially in astronomy. About 530 B.C. he was teaching that the light of the moon is the reflected light of the sun. A contemporary, Cleostratus of Tenedos, who lived rather outside the Ionian zone, made two very important contributions to astronomy. He made an improvement in the calendar, involving a better measurement of the solar year, and he introduced from Mesopotamia the knowledge of the signs of the zodiac.

These instances are enough to show not only that, among the Greeks of Asia Minor towards the end of the sixth century B.C., there was considerable speculative activity, but also that the sum of positive knowledge was being systematically increased. The process was aided by the roving character of the Asiatic Greeks. They were active and daring seamen, and brought back to their homes many records of their adventures by land and sea.

Of the early explorers, the most distinguished was Hecataeus of Miletus. He visited not only the whole of Greece but also Egypt, the provinces

**Earliest of the Great Explorers** of the Persian Empire, the coasts of the Black Sea,

Thrace and Libya. About 500 B.C. he adventured westward to the Gulf of Genoa and as far as Spain. He collected his experiences into a geographical handbook, and this was used as a quarry by subsequent writers. Hecataeus is memorable for having exhibited that scepticism of the marvellous which is one of the hall-marks of the man of science, as it is a condition for the security of scientific observation. He detested mythology. 'The stories of the Greeks,' he says, 'are in my opinion as numerous as they are absurd.'

About the end of the sixth or beginning of the fifth century, the character of Ionian thought was modified by increased contact with Persia. That power, under its great king Darius I (522-486 B.C.), was advancing steadily westward, and the weak and quarrelsome little Asiatic Greek states were coming under its shadow. Many Greeks took service with the Persians, and thus brought further knowledge of the world back to their native homes. Among the more typical of these men was the Dorian physician, Democedes of

Cnidus. After travelling widely in Greek lands, he became the medical attendant of Darius. Later he was employed as a spy to explore the coasts of Greece. He escaped from this service, however, settling in the Greek colony at Croton, in the instep of Italy. Here he devoted himself to writing a treatise on medicine, the first Greek work on that subject of which we have tidings. Croton became a very important scientific centre.

Thus, as time wore on, Ionian thinkers came more closely into contact with other civilizations. Their work gives an impression of increased sophistication. Philosophy is no longer the product of the leisure hours of business men, sailors and physicians. Thinking has become a profession.

Amongst the great Ionians who occupied themselves exclusively with philosophy was Heraclitus of Ephesus (c. 540-475 B.C.). His preoccupation with metaphysics, however important in itself, reduced the services which he might have rendered to physical science. He is best remembered for his view that 'everything is in a state of flux' and that change is the only reality. 'There's nothing is and nothing was, but everything's becoming.' Fire, the most changeable of elements, he regarded as the origin of all things. We have no scientific work of Heraclitus, only a fifth-century biological treatise written under his inspiration. From it we learn that all creatures are formed of a mixture of fire and water, that nothing is born or dies, but that what we call birth and death are but a re-arrangement of the water and fire of which we are made.

Very different from Heraclitus was his younger contemporary, the Milesian Leucippus, who flourished

about 475 and was the **Founder of the founder of the atomic Atomic Doctrine** doctrine of matter. That

theory has had a very wide influence in both ancient and modern times. Moreover, it has set its mark on the thought of men of science in all ages and has often been productive of that attitude towards the world known sometimes as philosophic materialism.

Historically, however, Leucippus is overshadowed by his pupil, Democritus (about 470 to about 400 B.C.). The birthplace

of Democritus is uncertain, and is variously given as Miletus in Ionia and as Abdera in Thrace. He was a contemporary of Socrates (470-399 B.C.), though the outlook of the two men is in the strongest possible contrast.

For Democritus all things are made up of the atoms and the space, or void, between. This void has as much claim to be regarded as a primary reality as the atoms themselves. The atoms are eternal and invisible, and they are so small that they cannot be divided. The word 'atom,' indeed, means 'indivisible.' The atoms are incompressible and homogeneous; they differ from one another only in form, arrangement and size, that is to say, only in quantity, not in quality. The qualities that we distinguish in things are thus not native to the atoms of which they are composed. The qualities are, it is held, produced by movement of these atoms. Just as atoms are eternal and uncaused, so also is motion, which must, of its nature, originate in preceding motion. As everything is made up of these unchangeable and eternal atoms, it follows that coming into being and passing away are but a seeming. Such a view has obvious parallels to modern doctrines of the indestructibility of matter and the 'conservation of energy.' Despite the positive trend of the thought of Democritus, his ultimate followers, known as Epicureans, after Epicurus of Samos (342-272 B.C.), showed little tendency to extend the range of scientific ideas.

Towards the end of the fifth century B.C. the intellectual life of Greece was passing from Asia to Attica: the life of the Ionian Anaxagoras of Clazomenae marks this change. Anaxagoras left his native home as a young man and went to Athens. There he came into contact with the statesman Pericles (490-429

B.C.), and inspired the dramatist Euripides (480-406 B.C.) with his own love of science.

Anaxagoras developed rational theories of many celestial phenomena. He attempted to construct scientific accounts of eclipses, meteors and rainbows. The sun he looked upon as a mass of white-hot metal larger than the Peloponnesian peninsula; other heavenly bodies he regarded as pieces of stone, rendered incandescent by rapid rotation. Such rationalism outraged the religious opinion of the day, and Anaxagoras was prosecuted for impiety. Defended by Pericles and acquitted, he yet found it prudent to withdraw to Asia Minor.

Much of the spirit of Ionia is summed up in the life and writings of Herodotus



#### NATURAL PHILOSOPHER RATHER THAN SCIENTIST

Heracleitus of Ephesus (c. 500 B.C.) lived before the days of Greek portraiture, so the value of this late work, identified from the attitude in which he appears on early Ephesian coins, might be doubted. But the features of great men were long remembered, and we probably have here a fair portrait.

*Candia Museum; from Delbrück, 'Antike Porträts'*

of Halicarnassus (about 484-425 B.C.). The native town of this remarkable man was a part of the Persian Empire at the time of his birth, and he remained a Persian subject till he was well into the thirties. He is particularly important as a subject of study, since his work has come down to us in almost complete form.

From an early date the inquiring spirit of Herodotus led him to travel. He explored Greece and Asia Minor very thoroughly, visiting many of the islands of the Greek Archipelago. He made the long and difficult journey from Sardis in Lydia near Smyrna to Susa, the Persian capital. He travelled to Babylon, explored the coast of the Black Sea and penetrated into Scythia and Thrace. His journeys were extended westward and he visited Italy and Sicily. Southward he descended into Syria, sojourned at Tyre, saw something of Palestine and made a long stay in Egypt. Wherever he heard of anything curious or interesting he stayed for a time and noted what he saw. He settled finally in a Greek colony in Italy, and probably spent the rest of his life in preparing his delightful History.

This work of Herodotus gives us an excellent idea of the geographical knowledge of his day (see map in Chap. 51). His careful observations on the nature and habits of men of different races justify us in regarding his work as the first treatise on the science of Man. He is thus the father of anthropology, as he is also the father of history. His many allusions to the beliefs and practices of the time also help us to check the early records of the history of science.

From a very early date Greeks had penetrated westward and had established colonies in Southern Italy and in Sicily—Magna Graecia, as the district was called. The schools in this area played a very important part in the history of Greek science; the earliest and the most important of them was that of the Pythagoreans.

The founder of this school or sect, Pythagoras (see also page 1453), was himself an Ionian; he was born on the island of Samos about 582 B.C. and travelled widely. About 529 he settled

in the city of Croton, where a Dorian colony had been established. Here he founded his brotherhood or sect, which persisted long after him. He left nothing in writing, and the veil of mystery which his followers drew over themselves prevents us, in many cases, from ascribing the scientific advances which they made to their actual originators.

From the hazy philosophical outlook of the Pythagoreans there emerge certain ideas which have had a profound influence. Foremost is their peculiar teaching on the subject of numbers. These were held to have a real and separate existence outside our minds. The use by the Greeks, as by the Hebrews, of letters to express numbers gave an especial currency to this conception, which was capable of and received all sorts of mystical and magical application. An instance will readily come to the mind in connexion with the number of the beast in the Book of Revelation.

The word 'mathematics' itself—which means simply 'learning'—was given its special relationship to numbers by the Pythagoreans. Aristotle tells us in his *Metaphysics* that—

the Pythagoreans devoted themselves to mathematics. They thought that its principles were principles of all things, and were by nature the first. In numbers they saw many resemblances to the things that exist and are coming into being—such and such a modification of number being Justice, another Soul and Reason, another Opportunity, almost all things being numerically expressible. Again they regarded the attributes and ratios of the musical scale as capable of expression in numbers. They therefore supposed numbers to be the elements of all things, and the whole heaven to be a musical and numerical scale. The arrangement of the heavens they collected and fitted into their scheme. Thus, as the number 10 was thought to be perfect and to comprise in itself the whole nature of numbers, they said that the bodies which move through the heavens were ten; but since the visible heavenly bodies are but nine, they invented a 'counter-earth.'

Passing from these more general conceptions of the Pythagoreans to their positive achievements we observe that these proceed naturally from their doctrines. We have seen Aristotle touch

upon their conception of the harmony of the spheres. This created an interest in music, and led them to the observation that the pitch of musical notes depends on a simple numerical ratio in the length of the chord struck.

Similarly, from their doctrine of numbers they made important advances in pure or abstract mathematics, apart from concrete application. They erected a system of plane geometry in which were formulated the principal theorems which concern parallels, triangles, quadrilateral and regular polygonal figures and angles. They discerned many important properties of prime numbers and progressions, and in particular they worked out the theory of proportion which was of great importance as providing the link between arithmetic and geometry.

The most striking mathematical achievement of the Pythagorean thinkers is perhaps their attainment

of a conception of the nature of 'irrational numbers.' Their proof of the existence of such quantities is determined by reaching the absurdity that if the diameter of a square is commensurable with its side, an even number must at the same time be odd. This discovery led to the abandonment of the old theory of proportion which recognized ratios only of whole numbers. With the imperfect system of mathematical notation of the time, however, great algebraical advance was impossible, and irrational numbers could not be algebraically represented. Greek mathematics was, therefore, given rather a geometrical bias, and this it retained throughout. We may say that the Greeks constantly resorted to geometrical when we should prefer algebraical methods.


Faced with the difficulty of the existence of quantities and ratios that they had no means of expressing, the Pythagoreans denoted algebraic expressions by lines and areas. A very simple instance will suffice. The equation  $(x+y)^2 = x^2 + 2xy + y^2$  was geometrically proved by them in the following manner, by reference to such a figure as the adjoining:

If  $AB=GH=DC=x$ , and  $BC=HK=AD=y$ , then the great square  $AK = (x+y)^2$ , is seen to be made of the small squares

$DH=x^2$ , and  $BF=y^2$ , together with the two equal rectangles  $AE+EK=2xy$ .

In addition to their mathematical achievements, the Pythagoreans made an important contribution to astronomical thought, for they were the first to maintain that the earth and the heavenly bodies were spheres. They were led to these conclusions by their mystical view that the sphere was the perfect figure. This important advance is among the many in the history of science in which practical observation has followed and has not preceded the formation of general ideas on theoretical grounds.

An interesting astronomical hypothesis was put forward in the fifth century by the Pythagorean Philolaus. He abandoned the theory that the Earth is the mid-point of the universe, and supposed that it is similar to the other planets in its movements, and that all revolve round a central




#### GEOMETRY INSTEAD OF ALGEBRA

Where we would employ algebraic methods the Pythagoreans had to be content with geometrical demonstrations. This is a diagram of their geometrical proof of the simple equation  $(x+y)^2 = x^2 + 2xy + y^2$ , as explained in the text.

fire. This fire, he held, is invisible to us, since the part of the earth which we inhabit is always turned away from it. To balance his system he invented a 'counter-earth' bringing his heavenly bodies up to the sacred number 10, that is to say, Sun, Moon, Earth, five planets, counter-earth and central fire (compare Aristotle opposite). His conception of a moving





#### ACCURATE OBSERVATION OF NATURE

The observational methods of the Western scientific school are reflected in the accurate animal studies of fourth-century Italian vase painters. Above: *Sargus vulgaris* (sheephead); *Crenilabrus mediterraneus* (wrasse); and, probably, *Uranoscopus niger* (a kind of weaver).

earth influenced the astronomer Copernicus (1473-1543) two thousand years later.

During the fifth century B.C. there developed among the Western Greeks settled in Italy and Sicily a remarkable naturalistic art; painters closely observed and represented the parts and structure of animals. This naturalistic tendency is reflected by the Italo-Greek scientific thinkers. Among these was Alcmaeon of Croton (c. 500 B.C.), a pupil of Pythagoras, who extended the scientific sphere to living things. He began the practice of dissection, and we have some record of his anatomical achievements. He discovered the optic nerves. Alcmaeon described also those tubes, extending from the mouth to the ear, through which,


if the nose be pinched and the mouth distended by the breath, air can be felt to be driven into the ear drums. These tubes were next investigated by the anatomist Eustachio (died 1574), after whom they are now called the Eustachian tubes. Eustachio lived in Italy more than twenty-two centuries after Alcmaeon!

A very important Western thinker, upon whom Pythagoras had some influence, was Empedocles of Agrigento in Sicily, who lived from about 500 to about 430 B.C. In biology Empedocles is responsible for the doctrine that the blood is the seat of the mysterious 'innate heat,' an idea taken from folk belief that 'the blood is the life.' This innate heat he closely identified with the soul. He held the heart to be the centre of the system of blood vessels through which the innate heat, or essential factor of life, is distributed to the bodily parts.

Empedocles, as the account of his philosophic views in page 1453 has shown, supposed that Love and Strife alternately held sway over all things. Everywhere there was opposition and affinity, and in matter itself the so-called four 'elements' could be distinguished as exhibiting these relationships. All matter was held to be made up of the four essential elements—earth, air, fire and water. These were in opposition or alliance to one another. Thus water was opposed to fire, but allied to earth. Each of the elements was, moreover, in its turn compounded of a pair of the four 'primary

qualities,' heat and cold, moisture and dryness (see adjoining diagram). These qualities exhibit affinity and opposition as do the elements.

It must not be imagined that these 'elements' were the substances that we know by the names of earth, water, air and fire in this world below. On our earthly sphere we find such things only in combination. Thus the substance we know as water, though it contains a



#### THEORY OF THE ELEMENTS

The biological teaching of Empedocles was largely influenced by views about the so-called 'elements,' wherein four primary qualities (hot, cold, wet and dry) combined to form the four primary substances, fire, water, air and earth.

preponderance of that element, contains also small amounts of the other three elements. It is the essence of water which is the element water, an essence that we can never apprehend. The doctrine has left its mark on our language. We still speak of a storm as 'the raging of the elements'; we wear coats 'to protect' ourselves from the elements'; and we think of 'elemental forces.' We still read the passage in Galatians in which S. Paul adjures us not to 'turn again to the weak and beggarly elements'; nor have we difficulty in understanding references to a 'fiery nature' or to an 'aerial spirit.' These things come to us from Empedocles, and they come through Aristotle.


By the end of the fifth century B.C. the Eastern and Western schools of the Greeks were becoming overshadowed by Athens. The greater complexity of life was making itself ever more felt. The systematic accumulation of knowledge was beginning to render a little old-fashioned those who 'took all knowledge to be their province.' There were still men who called themselves 'philosophers,' and their eloquence entertained and attracted the volatile Greeks beyond anything else. But these men had now become for the most part professional talkers, 'sophists' as they were called, who often had little direct acquaintance with scientific matters.

In these circumstances, something in the nature of scientific specialisation began to appear, and this especially in two departments, mathematics and medicine. By a curious chance, the two most typical early exponents of these disciplines bore the same name and came from neighbouring and similarly named islands: the physician, Hippocrates of Cos, and the mathematician, Hippocrates of Chios.

Hippocrates the physician was born on the island of Cos, which is situated just inside the Dorian zone. He came of a family of physicians. Both on his own island and on the opposite peninsula of Cnidus medical schools had long been

established. Scores of medical works have come down to us bearing his name. Few if any are by him, but some of them represent the traditional and empirical practice of the schools of Cos and Cnidus. It was the destiny of Hippocrates of Cos to transform much of this practice.

Of the details of the life of Hippocrates of Cos we know very little. He was born about 460 B.C. and is said to have died in his hundredth year, a very appropriate age for a great physician! He led a wandering life and followed his profession




#### MEMORIAL TO THE SKILL OF EMPEDOCLES

Empedocles of Acragas (c. 450 B.C.) is said to have stayed a plague of malaria that was afflicting the city of Selinus; and in certain coins we seem to have the event commemorated. Here (left) the river god Selinus sacrifices at the altar of Asclepius, while on the obverse appear Apollo and Artemis.

British Museum

in Thrace, in the neighbourhood of the sea of Marmora, on the island of Thasos, at Athens and elsewhere. He had many pupils, among whom were his sons and sons-in-law. This is practically all we know of him. The glimpse is dim and distant. Yet we cannot exaggerate the influence on medicine and the value for physicians of all time of the traditional picture that was early formed of Hippocrates, and that, indeed, may well be drawn again from the works bearing his name.

In beauty and dignity that figure is beyond praise. Perhaps gaining in stateliness what he loses in clearness, Hippocrates will ever remain the type of the perfect physician. Learned, observant, humane, with a profound reverence for the claims of his patients, but possessed of an overmastering desire that his experience shall benefit others, orderly and calm, disturbed only by anxiety to record his knowledge for the use of his brother



#### GRAVE-FEATURED FATHER OF MEDICINE

Hippocrates of Cos is the greatest figure in the history of medicine. We know little about him personally, but out of a mass of so-called Hippocratic writings there are some that express the spirit of his teachings. He profoundly impressed his contemporaries and gave rise to a long series of idealised busts.

*British Museum: photo, Mansell*

physicians and for the relief of suffering, grave, thoughtful and reticent, pure of mind and master of his passions, this is no overdrawn picture of the Father of Medicine as he appeared to his contemporaries and successors. It is a figure of character and virtue which has had an ethical value to medical men of all ages comparable only to the influence exerted by the founders of the great religions on their followers. The numerous busts of Hippocrates which have survived into our time are not portraits, but the best of them are something much more helpful to us than any portrait. They are idealised representations of the kind of man a physician should be in the eyes of the best and wisest of the Greeks.

The method of the Hippocratic writers is that now known as 'inductive.' Without the vast scientific heritage that is ours to-day, with but a small number of

observations drawn from scattered and unorganized experiences, surrounded by all manner of bizarre oriental religions in which no adequate relation of cause and effect was recognized, above all constantly urged by the exuberant genius for speculation of that Greek people in the midst of whom they lived and whose intellectual temptations they shared, the Hippocratic physicians remained, nevertheless, patient observers of fact, sceptical of the marvellous and the unverifiable, hesitating to theorise beyond the facts, yet eager to generalise from actual experience. They were calm, faithful, effective servants of the sick. There is almost no type of mental activity known to us that was not exhibited by the Greeks and cannot be paralleled from their writings; but careful and constant return to verification from experience, expressed in a record of actual observations—the habitual method adopted in modern scientific departments—is rare among

them, except with these early medical authors.

The spirit of their practice cannot be better illustrated than by the words of the so-called Hippocratic oath:


I will look upon him who has taught me this art even as those who bore me; I will share with him my substance, and supply his necessities if need be; I will regard his offspring as my own brethren, and I will teach them this art, if they desire to learn it, without fee or stipulation.

I will impart the knowledge of this art by precept, by lecture and by all other modes of instruction, to my own sons, to the sons of him who taught me and to disciples bound by covenant and oath according to the law of the physicians, but to none other.

The treatment I adopt shall be for the benefit of my patients, according to my ability and judgement, and not for their injury nor for any evil purpose. I will not give a deadly drug to anyone, though it be asked of me, nor will I lead the way in such counsel; nor will I aid a woman to procure

abortion. I will keep my life and my art pure and holy. Whatsoever house I enter, there will I go for the benefit of the sick, refraining from all wrongdoing and corruption, and especially from any act of seduction, whether of male or female, bond or free. Whatsoever I see or hear concerning the life of men, in my attendance on the sick or even apart therefrom, which ought not to be spoken of abroad, I will keep silence thereon, counting the secrecy of such things to be sacred.

The Hippocratic writings, important for the history of medicine, are important, too, for the conception that they contain of the nature of science. This conception is peculiarly well brought out in a treatise on the falling sickness, or epilepsy. In those days the affliction was held to be of the order of a divine visitation, and was known as the 'sacred disease.' A Hippocratic writer—possibly Hippocrates himself—wrote a book on it, in which he sets forth admirably the proper attitude of the scientific man towards supernatural claims. It is a monument of the rational spirit, and is perhaps the first book that has come down to us in which there is clear opposi-



#### FOR CUPPING AND BLEEDING

A votive tablet dedicated in the temple of Asclepius at Athens shows some of the appliances of the Greek surgeon's art: two cupping vessels and a folding case, very modern in appearance, containing scalpels and lancets. From Milne 'Surgical Instruments in Greek Times,' Clarendon Press

tion between the scientific and the religious points of view. One passage tells us:

As for this disease called divine, surely it too has its nature and causes whence it originates, just like other diseases, and is curable by means comparable to their cure.



#### PATIENT RECEIVING TREATMENT AT THE HANDS OF A GREEK PHYSICIAN

A vase painting of about 400 B.C. shows a Greek physician in his clinic, cupping a patient from the median vein. Other patients await their turn for treatment: a man leaning on a staff (left), his chest bandaged; a dwarf obviously suffering from achondroplasia (mal-development); a man with his left leg bandaged; a sitting figure bandaged in the region of the biceps; and a man smelling a flower, perhaps to ward off infection. Cupping vessels hang on the wall behind.

From E. Pottier, 'Une clinique grecque au cinquième siècle,' in 'Monuments Piot'

It arises—like other diseases—from things which enter and quit the body, such as cold, the sun and the winds, things which are ever changing and are never at rest. Such things are divine or not—as you will, for the distinction matters not—and there is no need to make such division anywhere in nature, for all are alike divine or all are alike human. All have their antecedent causes which can be found by those who seek them.

Hippocrates of Chios flourished about the year 430 B.C. Though a little older, he was thus contemporary with Hippocrates of Cos. He is the first person of whom we hear as having compiled a work on the Elements of Geometry, the subject which has made a household word of the name of his successor, Euclid of Alexandria (third century B.C.; see Chap. 73). Hippocrates of Chios is the first example that we encounter of a mathematical 'specialist.' He is said to have begun life

as a business man who exhibited little general intelligence and was dull of wit. Chance brought him to mathematics. He came to Athens on a law-suit to recover a sum of money lost in trading operations by the action of pirates. Athens was rapidly becoming the great centre of learning, and there Hippocrates had an opportunity of consorting with mathematicians. His real abilities soon asserted themselves, and henceforth he devoted himself with ardour to the subject. Unlike most Greeks, however, he exhibited little desire to go beyond his special study.

The work of Hippocrates of Chios may be illustrated by his most famous and one of his most acute investigations. This will

give an idea of the standard to which mathematics had attained in Greece about the year 400. Hippocrates discovered that the 'lune' bounded by an arc of  $90^\circ$ , and by a semicircle upon its chord, is equal in area to the triangle formed by the corresponding chord with the centre



#### GREEK USE OF THE SURGICAL BANDAGE

A masterpiece of the Athenian vase painter Euphronius portrays Achilles putting a surgical bandage on his friend Patroclus. The method of bandaging is quite modern, but the artist has mistakenly shown the two tails going round the arm in the same direction, so that Achilles will be unable to fasten them.

*Berlin Museum*

as its apex. As seen in the opposite page,  $ACB = ADB$ . The lune—that is, a figure bounded by circular curves—being thus equated with a figure bounded by straight lines, its area can be ascertained.

This geometrical method of ascertaining the area of a curved figure gave rise to intense interest. Hippocrates pursued his researches further and discovered two other lunes which could also be squared. Both these cases are special and peculiar figures. Finally, he discovered a particular lune which, when added to a circle, enables the whole to be represented geometrically as a square; this lune by itself cannot, however, be squared, and so the method cannot be used for squaring the circle. These remarkable researches became misrepresented by his successors, and tradition told of him that he had succeeded in squaring the circle! It is only in comparatively modern times that we have learnt the real achievement of Hippocrates of Chios. His proofs involve long study and imply great familiarity on his part with advanced geometric methods.

They are based on the theorem, which he himself proved, that circles are to one another as the square of their diameters.

Thus in the fifth century B.C. the two scientific disciplines of medicine and of mathematics had emerged as special preoccupations of men set aside from their fellows. A third topic, astronomy, was slower in being separated from the general body of philosophy, since the conception that men form of the general order of things is closely related to their idea of the structure of the world in which they live. Even in this department, however, signs of separation began now to appear.

Thus, the philosopher Eudoxus of Cnidus, who lived in the early part of the fourth century B.C., practised at Athens as an astronomer and mathematician. He studied under the Pythagoreans, and was a friend of Plato. Among his achievements is his remarkably accurate estimate of the solar year as 365 days and 6 hours. Under the stimulus of Plato he made important contributions to mathematical theory. For true astronomical specialisation, however, we have to wait for the Alexandrian school (see Chap. 73).

The earlier phase of Greek thought terminated with the fifth century in a thinker of a very individual type, Socrates (470-399 B.C.; see also Chap. 47). His name is associated with a great intellectual revolution, perhaps the greatest that the world has seen. The overwhelming preoccupation of Socrates was with conduct; for him 'Knowledge is Virtue.' The attitude of Socrates towards the sciences of his day has been set forth by his pupil Xenophon (430-350 B.C.), who tells us:

With regard to astronomy Socrates considered a knowledge of it desirable to the extent of determining the day of the year or of the month and the hour of the night; but as for learning the courses of the stars, occupying one's self with the planets or inquiring about their distance from the Earth or about their orbits or the causes of their movements, to all these he strongly


objected as waste of time. He dwelt on the contradictions and conflicting opinions of the physical philosophers . . . and, in fine, he held that speculators on the Universe and on the laws of the heavenly bodies were no better than madmen.

The triumph of the Socratic revolution depressed Greek science and physical philosophy for a while. But out of the conflict between the Socratics and the physical philosophers arose the main streams of later Greek thought. These two streams derive their titles and their tendencies from the two gigantic figures that occupy the stage during the fourth century. It is the century of Plato and Aristotle.

The thought of Plato (427-347), like that of his master Socrates, was dominated by the ethical motive, and these aspects of his character are dealt with in the preceding chapter. Plato and Convinced, like his master, the Academy that Truth and Good exist and that they are inseparable, he embarked on an inquiry which had as its object to expose, account for and resolve into one comprehensive theory the discrepancies of ordinary thinking. During this process he developed a doctrine destined to be of great moment for the subsequent relations of scientific thought with that which comes under the heading of religion and philosophy. It is the so-called 'doctrine of ideas.'

The nature of this doctrine and the manner in which Plato reached it have been briefly set forth by his pupil, Aristotle, in the *Metaphysics*.

In his youth Plato became familiar with the doctrines of certain philosophers that all things perceived by the senses are ever in a state of flux and there is no knowledge concerning them. To these views he held even in later years. Socrates, however, busied himself about ethical matters, neglecting the world of nature, but seeking the universal in conduct. He it was who fixed thought for the first time on definitions. Plato accepted his teaching but held that the problem applied not to anything perceived



AREA OF A LUNE

This diagram, explained in the text, illustrates the astonishingly advanced geometric methods of Hippocrates of Chios, who dealt largely with the areas of curvilinear figures.

by the senses, but to something of another sort. His reason was that the common definition could not be a definition of things perceived by the senses because they were always changing. Things of this sort he called Ideas, and things perceived by the senses, he said, were different from these (Ideas) and were all called after them.

Thus concepts, things of the mind, became for Plato something very concrete, while our impressions of the material universe, percepts, became something very vague.

Plato expresses a great admiration for mathematical principles, and he regards mathematics as exhibiting that type of certitude and exactness to which other studies should conform. Now, mathematics relies for the material on which it works upon something of the nature of Plato's Ideas. It might be expected, therefore, that mathematics would appeal to him. Many of Plato's thoughts assume a mathematical guise; and he exhibits at times a view which seems to approach that of Pythagoras, who had attached a moral and spiritual value to numbers (see page 1472).

The general attitude of Plato was, however, much less favourable to the physical sciences. He naturally could not regard with aught but scorn the material theories of such writers as Democritus. Nevertheless, he speaks with respect of Hippocrates, the very type of scientific investigator in antiquity. Plato's respect was, however, quite devoid of inclination to follow in his footsteps. Nor is this to be wondered at, for, apart from the relative unimportance of the place that he assigned to phenomena, Plato was in fact without those qualities which lend themselves to patient inductive observation.

Nevertheless, the great philosopher could not refrain from producing something in the way of a cosmic theory. The work in which this cosmic theory appeared, the *Timaeus*, gives a picture of the depth to which natural science can be degraded by a great mind in its endeavour to give a specific meaning to all parts of the universe. The trend of Platonism in general, and of the schools that arose from it, was always away from observational science, though not unfriendly to mathematics.

It has been well said that every man and woman that is born into the world is by nature a disciple either of Plato or of Aristotle. Aristotle himself has set forth for us the difference between the two attitudes, reduced to its simplest expression. It arises out of the discussion, in his great work *The Physics*, of the use of mathematical formulae. The bodies studied in the physical sciences have, of course, in them 'planes and solids, lines and points.' But such planes and solids, lines and points, are the subjects also of mathematical study. How, then, are we to distinguish the procedure of the mathematical from that of the physical sciences?

To this Aristotle answers that the mathematician does indeed study these things, but not as the 'limits of a physical body.' The objects of mathematics, though in fact inseparable from a physical, movable body, are studied in abstraction from movement. This process of abstraction necessarily involves error. The mistake made by Plato's theory of Ideas is that of attempting to abstract from matter things, entities, in whose very nature, unlike that of mathematical objects, matter is involved. Odd and even, straight and curved, number, line, figure—all these can be studied wholly out of connexion with movement or change. Such things as flesh, bone, man, nay, even inorganic nature, cannot be so studied. Change is indeed an essential part of nature and fundamental to real existence, as Thales, the father of science, had seen. Yet change has to be ignored in pure mathematical investigation. This principle of change or movement prevents nature from ever really repeating herself, while in mathematical conceptions one unit must be exactly like another.

We may see the effect of the two attitudes in the biological works of the two great philosophers. So far as science is concerned, it is by their fruits that we must know them. The biological views of Plato are shrouded in the repulsive pages of the *Timaeus*. In this work he is led by an inner light that is here, if ever, deceptive and distorting. He has elevated into picture form, from an idea, a mechanism

How Aristotle  
differs from Plato

that never was on land or sea. On the other hand, in the great biological works of Aristotle—other aspects of his thought have been studied in Chapter 47—we have a magnificent series of first-hand observations and positive studies to which naturalists in all ages will return with delight and refreshment.

The importance of Plato, so far as the subsequent development of science is concerned, must therefore be sought almost exclusively in the department of mathematics. Plato was, in fact, an accomplished mathematician and had had Pythagorean teachers. He made no actual discovery or contribution to the subject, but he exerted influences upon it the importance of which it would not be easy to overrate. These influences may be arranged in four categories.

In the first place, it is through Plato that mathematics obtained and still retains a place in higher education. The abstractions of mathematics appealed to him, and he saw therein an instrument for the training of logical thought. The study of mathematics was thus for him the portal to philosophy. 'Let none who have not learnt mathematics enter here' is said to have been inscribed over the entrance of his school, the Academy.

Secondly, the hand of Plato may be traced in the actual course of mathematical development. To

**What mathematics owes to Plato** his logical teaching the system of elementary mathematics owes the

rigour and logical finish that have since distinguished it. This factor exhibited itself in his pupils and his spiritual descendants. Strange as it may appear, such a work as Euclid's *Elements* is in essence a product of Plato's thought. It is not an overstatement to say that, through Euclid, every schoolboy is nowadays a student of Plato.

Thirdly, the inspiration of Plato can be traced clearly in the history of astronomy. From an early stage he came to regard the observed irregular movements of the planets as inconsistent with his view of the essential perfection of the universe. These movements had, in his opinion, to be explained as somehow compounded of simple

circular movements, a conception that he derived from his Pythagorean teachers. Plato accordingly set his pupils the task of propounding rules by which the movements of the heavenly bodies could be reduced to a system of circles and spheres. The work of Eudoxus, to whom reference has been made above (page 1479), is an illustration of this tendency. This was the main task of astronomers from the time of Plato to that of Kepler—a stretch of two thousand years! During all that time the hand of Plato lay heavy upon astronomy, and even Copernicus did not free himself therefrom. In this matter Aristotle is largely Plato under another name.

Fourthly, Plato may be said to have made one important positive contribution to science, namely the

development of the analytical method in mathematics. It cannot be said that this is wholly his creation, since there are the germs of it to be found among the Pythagoreans, but its formal introduction is Plato's work. The method, in essence, consists in assuming the problem to be solved and working back from it until a statement is reached, the truth or falseness of which is already known. Thus, it may be discerned whether the problem is, in fact, soluble or not, and indications may be forthcoming as to the general direction of the solution and whether there are any limitations to it.

Plato's school, under the name of the Academy, persisted for many centuries, but was chiefly occupied with philosophical discussion. One of his first disciples—he was hardly his pupil—to distinguish himself in science was that Eudoxus whose work we have already considered.

Heracleides of Pontus (about 388–315 B.C.) was a real pupil of Plato. He advanced astronomy by claiming that the Earth rotates on its own axis once in twenty-four hours, and that Mercury and Venus circle about the Sun like satellites. The teaching of Heracleides led on to that of Aristarchus (see Chap. 73).

Important for subsequent mathematical developments was Menaechmus, a pupil



of Eudoxus. Menaechmus began the study of conic sections which was carried to great perfection by ancient mathematicians, especially of the Alexandrian school (Chap. 73). The study of conic sections was for many centuries of little practical importance. In modern times, with the astronomical discoveries of


with the school of the greatest of his pupils, the philosopher Aristotle.

Aristotle was born in 384 B.C., at Stagirus, a Greek colony a few miles from the northern limit of the present monastic settlement of Mount Athos. From his father, who was physician to the ruling prince of Macedonia, he may have inherited his taste for biological investigation. At seventeen Aristotle became a pupil of Plato at Athens. After his master's death in 347 he crossed the Aegean to reside in Asia Minor. The first draft of Aristotle's biological works and the mass of his own observations were made during his stay in this region.

In 342 B.C. Aristotle became tutor to the young crown prince, Alexander of Macedonia. He remained in Macedonia for seven years, and about 336—when Alexander departed for the invasion of Asia—Aristotle returned to Athens, where he taught at the Lyceum and established his famous school, afterwards called the Peripatetic. Most of his works were produced during this, the closing period of his life, between 335 and 323 B.C. He died in 322 B.C., and left a vast number of writings, only a portion of which deal with science.

The scientific works to which Aristotle's name is attached may be divided into three groups, physical, biological and psychological.

When we start to examine Aristotle's view on the material nature of the universe we at once encounter a conception that shuts us off from him. The revolution in the attitude towards the material universe of Aristotle introduced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by Kepler, Galileo and Newton was so fundamental, and resulted in such a complete destruction of the Aristotelian point of view, which had prevailed till then, that it is very difficult for us to go back in thought. We are brought up from early years with the idea of the uniformity of nature. It is a conception that we are not accustomed to question. Thus, for instance, we think of astronomers exploring the heavens and finding out new facts about worlds other and greater than our own, in which, however, the general physical laws of our own world also rule. If they did not so rule, we



#### THE UNIVERSE OF ARISTOTLE

According to the ideas of Aristotle, which were in many ways reactionary, the earth was a sphere fixed at the centre of the universe, the stars and planets moving in perfect circles round it with uniform velocity. This is a medieval elaboration of his system.

Kepler (1571-1630), the mathematical innovations of Descartes (1596-1650) and the optical work of Newton (1642-1727), the study of conic sections has become of great practical importance. There is no more amazing event in the history of thought than the application of these purely intellectual exercises of over two thousand years ago to the daily interpretation of nature in our own time.

Other members of the Academy made contributions to pure mathematics, and, in the sense which we have discussed, all subsequent mathematicians are Plato's spiritual heirs. There is also evidence of a certain amount of botanical activity in the Academy, and some physiological theories which became popular in later centuries may be traced to Plato. For the most part, however, we may say that Platonic influence was inimical to science, the advancement of which lay chiefly

might perhaps ask ourselves how could astronomers make discoveries at all? But this uniformity, evident and axiomatic to us; was by no means so to Aristotle. To him heaven was not only different from earth, but its ways were incommensurate with the ways of earth.

It has been urged against Aristotle that he obstructed the progress of astronomy by not identifying terrestrial and celestial mechanics, and by laying down the principle that celestial motions were regulated by peculiar laws. He placed the heavens beyond the possibility of experimental research, and at the same time impeded the progress of mechanics by his assumption of a distinction between 'natural' and 'unnatural' motion. On the other hand, we should remember that Aristotle gave an interest to the study of nature by his provision of a positive and tangible scheme.

It seems unfair to bring his own greatness as a charge against him. All our conceptions of the material world—'scientific theories' as we call them—are but temporary devices to be abandoned when occasion demands. That the scheme propounded by Aristotle lasted more than two thousand years is evidence of its symmetry and beauty and of the greatness of the mind that wrought it. That it received no effective criticism is no fault of Aristotle's, but is evidence of what dwarfs the men who followed him were by comparison with 'the master of those who know,' as he was called by one of the greatest of medieval thinkers.

Since, however, Aristotle's physical system has in fact fallen, and since it does not exhibit him as an experimental scientist, we will content ourselves with setting it forth in a series of its most important propositions:

1. Matter is continuous.
2. All matter is somehow made up of the four elements, earth, air, fire and water, which in their turn contain the four 'qualities,' heat, cold, dryness and moisture, in binary combination. (See page 1474.)
3. The earth is a sphere. It is fixed as the centre of the universe, which is itself spherical.
4. The stars and planets move with uniform velocity in concentric circles round the earth.

5. Circular movement is the most perfect conceivable and represents the changeless, eternal and perfect order of the heavens as contrasted with the mutable, mortal and imperfect order that prevails on this our earth.

6. The universe is finite.

According to modern scientific standards Aristotle appears at his best in the capacity of a biologist. To have made such a prodigious number of original observations as his biological works contain, we must suppose that he organized his pupils for their collection, though some of the observations have doubtless been added by his successors, the Peripatetics. In one of his great biological works, *On the Parts of Animals*, Aristotle sets forth his motives for the study of living things. The passage is of special interest, since it presents the contrast in his mind between 'physics'—which is for him a general description of the material world—and biology.

Of things constituted by nature some are ungenerated, imperishable, eternal; others subject to generation and decay. The former are excellent beyond compare and divine, but less accessible to knowledge. The evidence that might throw light on them, and on the problems which we would solve respecting them, is furnished but scantily by sensation. On the other hand, respecting perishable plants and animals we have abundant information, living as we do in their midst, and ample data may be collected concerning all their various kinds, if only we take sufficient pains. Both departments, however, have their own peculiar charm. The scanty conceptions to which we can attain of celestial things give us, from their excellence, more pleasure than all our knowledge of the world in which we live; just as a mere glimpse of those we love is more to us than the most glorious view of other things. On the other hand we may set the certitude and completeness of our knowledge of terrestrial things. Moreover, their nearness and affinity to us balances somewhat the loftier interest of the things of the heavens, that are the objects of the higher philosophy. But of a truth every realm of nature is marvellous. It is told that when strangers, finding Heracleitus at the kitchen fire, hesitated to go in, he bade them enter since, he said, 'gods were even in the kitchen.' So should we venture on the study of every kind of animal without distaste, for each and all will reveal something natural and beautiful. Absence of hazard and conduciveness of everything to an end are to be found in nature's works to the


highest degree, and the resultant of her generations and combinations is a form of the beautiful.

As every instrument and every bodily member subserves some partial end, some special action, so the whole body must be destined to minister to some plenary sphere of action. Thus, the saw is made for sawing, since sawing is a function, and not sawing for the saw. Similarly, the body too must somehow be made for the soul and each part thereof for some subordinate function to which it is adapted.

Aristotle is, in the fullest sense, a 'vitalist.' That is to say, he believes that the presence of a certain peculiar principle of a non-material character is essential for the exhibition of any of the phenomena of life. This principle we may call soul, translating the word 'psyche.' Living things, like all else in nature, have, according to Aristotle, an end or object.

Everything that nature makes is a means to an end. For just as human creations are the products of art, so living objects are manifestly the products of an analogous cause or principle. . . That the heaven, if it had an origin, was evolved and is maintained by such a cause, there is, therefore, even more reason to believe than that mortal animals so originated. For order and definiteness are much more manifest in the celestial bodies than in our own frame.

There can be no doubt that through much of the Aristotelian writings runs a belief in a kinetic as distinct from a static view of existence. It cannot be claimed that he regarded the different kinds of



#### ARISTOTLE'S ASCENDING SCALE OF LIFE


It would be exaggeration to say that Aristotle stated a doctrine of evolution, but he certainly arranged living forms in an upward ascending scale which, as seen here, bears some analogy to the modern classification.

living things as actually passing one into another, but there can be no doubt that he fully realized that the different kinds can be arranged in a series in which the gradations are easy. His scheme would be something like that represented in this page as a 'scala naturae' or 'Ladder of Nature.'

He writes in the History of Animals:

Nature proceeds by little and little from things lifeless to animal life, so that it is impossible to determine the exact line of demarcation, nor on which side thereof an intermediate form should lie. Thus, next after lifeless things in the upward scale comes the plant, and of plants one will differ from another as to its amount of apparent vitality; and, in a word, the whole plant kind, whilst devoid of life as compared with the animal, is yet endowed with life as compared with other corporeal entities. Indeed, there is observed in plants a continuous scale of ascent towards the animal.

It is very interesting to read what Aristotle has to say in connexion with such modern problems as the nature of generation, heredity, variation, and the like. We cannot here, however, follow him through the amazing variety and depth of his biological speculations, which have a permanent value and are constantly referred to by working biologists of the present day. Still less can we follow him into the storehouse of his



#### ARISTOTLE AS NATURALIST

The breeding habits of a certain dog-fish, which is viviparous (the embryo, A, deriving its nourishment from the mother's womb by means of a placenta and an umbilical cord), were accurately described by Aristotle but disbelieved until modern times. B, the young fish swimming free.

After J. Müller, 'Ueber den Bau des Aristoteles'

biological discoveries. Yet we can hardly leave his biological works without enumerating some of the more important of his positive biological achievements.

1. He made systematic embryological investigations, using the developing chick, which has since become the classical object for such researches. He describes the structure of the creature at different stages with great accuracy and acumen.

2. He investigated with particular skill the structure, habits and mode of development of a large number of fish.

3. His account of the habits and development of the octopuses and squids have in some cases been surpassed only in modern times.

4. His account of the development of certain species of dog-fish and of the habits of breeding of cat-fish, treated with derision in the past, have been actually verified by modern naturalists. Nothing has contributed more to Aristotle's reputation as an observing naturalist than this reversal of an historical verdict.


Aristotle's interesting psychological studies are only partly within our purview. The psychological questions with which we are concerned come mostly into his discussion of the nature of life.

According to Aristotle, the distinction between the living and not-living is to be sought not so much in its material constitution as in the absence or presence of 'soul,' and his teaching on that topic is to be found in his great work *On the Soul*. He does not think of matter as organic or inorganic—that is a distinction of the seventeenth-century physiologists—nor does he think of things as divided into animal, vegetable and mineral—that is a distinction of the medieval alchemists—but he thinks of things as either with soul or without soul (empsychic or apsyche). His belief as to the relationship of this soul to material things is difficult and complicated, but he tells us that 'there is a class of existent things which we call substance, including under that term, first,

matter, which in itself is not this nor that; secondly, shape or form, in virtue of which the term "this" or "that" is at once applied; thirdly, the whole, made up of matter and form. Matter is identical with potentiality, form with actuality,' the soul being, in living things, that which gives the form or actuality. 'Of natural bodies,' he continues, 'some possess life and some do not; where by life we mean the power of self-nourishment and of independent growth and decay.' It should be noted that in the Aristotelian sense the egg or germ is not at first a living thing, for in its earliest stage and before fertilisation it does not possess soul even in its most elementary form.

In a famous passage from his work *On the Soul* he says:

The term life is used in various senses, and if life is present in but a single one of these senses, we speak of a thing as alive. Thus, there is intellect, sensation, motion from place to place and rest, the motion



A WORTHY SUCCESSOR OF ARISTOTLE

Theophrastus approached even more closely than his master Aristotle to the modern evolutionary standpoint. He was born at Eresus, in Lesbos, and studied under Plato before joining the Peripatetics; following Aristotle in the presidency of the Lyceum, he worthily carried on the former's biological researches.

Villa Albani: photo. Atina

concerned with nutrition, and further there are the processes of decay and growth [all various meanings or at least exhibitions of some form of life]. Hence even plants have life, for they have within themselves a faculty whereby they grow and decay. They grow and live so long as they are capable of absorbing nutriment. This form of life can be separated from the others . . . plants have no other faculty of soul at all [but only this lowest vegetative soul]. In virtue of this principle all living things live, whether animals or plants, but it is sensation which primarily constitutes the animal. For, provided they have sensation, even those creatures even if incapable of movement are called animals. . . . As the nutritive faculty may exist without touch or any form of sensation, so also touch may exist apart from other senses.

Apart from these two lower forms of soul, the 'vegetative,' or nutritive and reproductive, and the 'animal,' or sensitive, stands the 'rational' or intellectual soul peculiar to Man, a form of soul which we shall not discuss here (see page 1464).

The possession of one or more of the three types of soul, vegetative, sensitive and rational, provides in itself a basis for an elementary form of arrangement of living things in an ascending scale.

We have already seen that Aristotle certainly describes something resembling a 'Scala Naturae.' We have now to point out that the basis of this scheme is really psychological, depending on the character of mind. It is indeed of the nature of Aristotle's method, and indeed of all good scientific method, that the various departments of investigation should thus interlock.

Aristotle's work was continued by his school, the Peripatetics (see also Chap. 47), of whom the best known was Theophrastus of Eresus (about 372 to 288 B.C.). This Theophrastus made important botanical researches and continued Aristotle's work in Aristotle's spirit. It is interesting to observe that he exhibits the same 'evolutionary' bias that characterised the biological work of his master. In one of his great botanical treatises Theophrastus observes that—

where there is growth there is life. Wherefore we should observe these things not for

what they are but for what they are becoming. And, moreover, though some be peculiar, yet the general plan can everywhere be traced and is never lost.

Of Theophrastus we shall have more to say in a later chapter (Chap. 71).

Among the Peripatetics of the first generation who made contributions to science was Dicaearchus, who wrote a description of the world accompanied by a map. The successors calculated the heights of various mountains and employed himself on physical geography. After the first generation, however, the Peripatetic school devoted itself to preserving or to commenting upon the work of their founder. They exhibited little originality, and from about 300 B.C. onwards Athens ceased to be a great scientific centre.

Despite this failure, a certain amount of scientific work continued for a while to be done at Athens. Thus Autolycus of Pitane in Asia Minor, who was a contemporary of Aristotle, and worked at his native town and at Sardis, expounded the geometry of the sphere for astronomical purposes. Important investigations were also stimulated by the conquests of Aristotle's pupil, Alexander. That great conqueror made an attempt to survey his empire by employing a special force of men to measure the distances of the main roads. The services of these men were available for other scientific purposes, such as collecting data, and Theophrastus profited by the information they supplied. Botanical investigations were made by certain of Alexander's commanders, such as his admirals, Nearchus and Androthenes, and portions of their botanical and geographical work are preserved by Theophrastus.

The natural scientific heir of the Alexandrian Empire is, however, Alexander's own city of Alexandria in Egypt. From about 300 B.C. until the downfall of the civilization of antiquity, Alexandria remained the chief centre of scientific knowledge, and in this respect Athens fell entirely into the shade. In Chapter 73 we shall pursue the subject of this later science.

# THE EASTWARD SPREAD OF HELLENISM

Far-reaching Results of the Impact of Greek Culture  
upon the distant Orient in the Days after Alexander

By H. G. RAWLINSON

Principal and Professor of English, Deccan College, Poona ; Author of *Intercourse  
Between India and the Western World*

THE spring of 334 B.C. witnessed an event which was destined to revolutionise the history of the West. Alexander of Macedon, at the head of his Graeco-Macedonian army, crossed the Hellespont, and landed on the historic shores of ancient Troy. Whether, then or later, Alexander actually realized the supreme significance of his action is open to question ; but, consciously or not, he was inaugurating a new era in the history of civilization. The day of the old, exclusive Greek city state was dead and gone for ever. Hellenic culture was destined to be reborn, in new and hitherto unimagined forms, on the banks of the Indus or amid the central Asian steppes.

When Alexander advanced into Asia Minor he found the Persian satraps awaiting him on the farther banks of the river Granicus. But the Macedonian army, as we have read in Chronicle VI, scattered them like chaff before the wind. Meanwhile, Darius, the Great King, had not been idle, and took the field with an array of 600,000 men. He came down upon Alexander's rear just as the latter was entering Syria. But he foolishly drew up his troops in the narrow plain of the Issus, between the mountains and the sea, and, cooped up in this death-trap, the Persian hosts were cut to pieces by the Macedonians.

Alexander now turned towards Tyre, and after capturing it went to Egypt, where he founded the city of Alexandria at the mouth of the Nile. Intended originally to displace Tyre as the great emporium of trade in the south-eastern Mediterranean, Alexandria became something far grander than this. No city was

destined to play a nobler part in the history of Hellenism. Here was collected the greatest library of the ancient world, which drew scholars and scientists from the ends of the earth, while in her porticoes and colonnades a motley cosmopolitan crowd, Jew and Gentile, Indian and Greek, rubbed shoulders and discussed philosophy and religion with unabated vigour. Alexandria was one of the most important links in that chain of Greek intercourse with the East which we are now to discuss.

Egypt subdued and organized, Alexander was at last free to turn his attention to Darius. After weeks of weary marching into the very heart of Persia, the Macedonians at length met their enemy on the plain of Gaugamela. All the gallantry of Persia was of no avail. The phalanx held firm against the vastly superior number of its opponents, while Alexander, at the head of his Companions, 'drank delight of battle with his peers,' as the Macedonian cavalry charged home again and again (October 1, 331 B.C.). Darius fled in wild panic, and the proud and ancient city of Babylon, the capital of Hammurabi and Nebuchadrezzar, opened its gates to the boy conqueror from the distant west. Susa followed, and then Persepolis, and the latter city was given over to fire and sword, as a symbol to all the world that Persian rule was over for ever.

The unhappy Darius, now a prisoner in the hands of his kinsman Bessus, the viceroy of Bactria, was fleeing northward with the Macedonian cavalry hard at his heels. At last, when the pursuit became too hot, the last of the heirs of 'Cyrus, the King,

Persia falls  
to Alexander

the Achaemenian,' was found, stabbed through and through, by the wayside.

Meanwhile, Bessus was far away, flying to distant Bactria to organize fresh resistance, and doubtless hoping that Alexander would be too exhausted to pursue him. But he was reckoning without his host. Alexander first of all subdued Aria, and founded a city, Alexander Arriae, the modern Herat, to watch over the country in his absence. After resting for the winter of 330-29, he proceeded to march southwards through Sacastene (Seistan) into Gedrosia (Baluchistan), and thence northwards towards the Hindu Kush mountains, or the Indian Caucasus, to give them their Greek name. He founded two more cities to guard his line of communications, one supposed to have stood on the site of the modern Kandahar, and the other, Alexandria-under-Caucasus (ad Caucasum), at the foot of the passes. Crossing the Hindu Kush with an armed force was a feat which few commanders would have cared to undertake, but it offered no obstacle to Alexander, and the spring of 328 found him

knocking at the gates of the ancient Bactra, now known as Balkh. Alexander determined to make Bactra the base for his final achievement, the conquest of India. First of all, however, it was necessary to overawe the Scythians beyond the Oxus, and for this purpose a campaign was undertaken which brought Alexander as far as the Jaxartes, where he founded a large fortress, Alexandria-the-Ultimate (Alexandria Eschatê), on the ground where Khojend now stands. This was the final outpost of Hellenism, looking out over the Scythian steppes and controlling the central Asian trade route through Kashgar into China, whence came the silk and jade to the markets of Europe.

As soon as the snows were off the passes in 326, the Macedonian army (now reinforced with local

contingents to replace Macedonian Invasion the veterans settled in of Northern India

the various military colonies en route) retraced its steps to Ortospana (Kabul) and then, following the Cophen (Kabul) river, entered India and crossed the Indus at Attock, after some hard fighting with the mountain tribes. Moving in a south-easterly direction, Alexander found himself confronted, on the banks of the Hydaspes (the modern Jhelum), by an army led by a prince of the name of Porus (Paurava, the son of Puru).

The Indian army went down, as the Persians had gone down, before the onslaught of the ever-victorious Macedonians, and Alexander pressed on to the banks of the Hyphasis (Beas). No doubt he would have marched on to the Gangetic plain and captured the imperial city of Pataliputra (Patna), which was his next objective, but the weary soldiers at last rebelled. Alexander, therefore, retreated westwards, and with the survivors of his army reached Susa in May 324 B.C., after suffering great hardships. Here he pressed forward his plans for amalgamating East and West. He had already married, in Bactria, the beautiful Roxana; he now added to his harem two Persian princesses, and many of his nobles followed his example. Various centres were established for recruiting and training Asiatic troops according to the Macedonian drill-book, a move which found no favour with his older Macedonian companions. But



GREEK ART ON A CARIAN TOMB

An early instance of the eastward spread of Hellenism is the employment of Greek architects and sculptors to construct the tomb of a Carian prince at Halicarnassus—the 'Mausoleum.' This graceful charioteer figured in the frieze.

British Museum

Alexander had already shown that he would brook no interference.

All his plans were cut short, however, when he died in Babylon, of fever, in June, 323 B.C., at the age of 33. We may search history in vain to find a parallel to Alexander's career. He was no mere brilliant barbarian, pursuing a wild-goose chase across Asia, as H. G. Wells would have us believe. His work, although he may not have realized all its stupendous consequences, was always constructive. The unerring instinct which guided him in the foundation of military colonies on his line of march is amply justified when we remember that practically all of them survive as strategic and commercial centres of the utmost importance to-day.

On the death of the master-spirit, the Empire collapsed. After a period of confused fighting, two great kingdoms emerged in the Near East, Egypt under Ptolemy I Soter, and Syria under Seleucus, who seized Babylon in 312 B.C. Syria is really a misnomer, for the kingdom of Seleucus included the whole of the old Persian Empire as far as the Hindu Kush, and indeed at first did not include Syria at all. In the Farther East, new states appeared under various adventurers. In India, one Chandragupta Maurya had made himself master of Pataliputra, and on the news of the death of Alexander had expelled the Greek rulers from the Punjab (317 B.C.). When Seleucus tried to subdue him in 305 B.C., Chandragupta defeated the invader and formed a treaty with him which included an 'alliance by marriage,' which perhaps means that a Greek princess entered the harem of the Indian monarch. Seleucus also gave up the eastern provinces of his Empire (the modern Baluchistan and Afghanistan), which he could never hope to control, in exchange



THE SEVENTH WONDER OF THE WORLD


Halicarnassus, the modern Budrum, was captured by Alexander the Great in 334 B.C. It was world-famous for the monument raised to the memory of Mausolus, king of Caria, by his widow Artemisia (see reconstruction in page 1189). These figures of the royal pair stood in the chariot on the summit.

*British Museum*

for five hundred elephants, by whose help he crushed his rival Antigonus at Ipsus in 301, thereby winning Syria. Meanwhile, the relations between the Seleucid and Mauryan courts remained of the most cordial character. Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador, resided for many years at Pataliputra and wrote a fascinating account (much of which still survives in the words of later writers) of what he saw there. Chandragupta's grandson Asoka, on his conversion to Buddhism (see Chap. 40), hastened to dispatch missionaries to preach the Law to his brother monarchs, the kings of Syria, Egypt, Cyrene and Epirus.

Farther north, two important events occurred about 250 B.C. A patriotic Parthian named Arsaces headed a national





#### REGIONS WHERE GREEK AND INDIAN CULTURE INTERMINGLED

When Seleucus inherited the eastern parts of Alexander's dominions he found it impossible to maintain his hold on anything beyond the Indus, and finally ceded Afghanistan and Baluchistan to the Indian emperor, Chandragupta the Maurya. On the break-up of the Mauryan Empire, c. 200 B.C., it was the Greek kings of a now independent Bactria, not the Seleucid emperors, who reoccupied the lost territory and invaded the Punjab. Parthia had also become independent under Arsaces.

revolt, and laid the foundations of a kingdom which was destined to be a thorn in the flesh of the Roman Empire for nearly five centuries. In Bactria the governor, Diodotus, declared for independence, and Antiochus the Great failed to put down his successor, Euthydemus, though he defeated him in battle in 208.

Demetrius, son of Euthydemus, 'the great Emetrius, the King of Ind,' shadowy stories of whose conquests lingered on even in the days of Chaucer, was a mighty conqueror. He extended the rule of Bactria right up to the Pamirs, so as

to control the central Asian trade routes. Then, profiting by the break-up of the Mauryan Empire, he invaded the Punjab, where he founded a new capital, which he named Euthydemia, at Sangala (perhaps the modern Sialkot). Meanwhile a rival of the name of Eucratides had set himself up in Bactra. The northern kingdom was extinguished about 165 B.C. or later, when the Sacae or Scythians, forced southwards by tribal movements among the Yueh-chi of central Asia, crossed the Oxus, and drove the Greeks across the mountains into India.

After this a number of petty Greek principalities arose in the Kabul country and along the Afghan frontier. For a moment Greek rule flared up in a brilliant Indian summer of greatness under Menander, the only one of the later monarchs to achieve lasting fame. Menander was born at Alexandria-under-Caucasus, and about 160 B.C. he became king of Sangala. Of his capital, the author of the Buddhist dialogue entitled the Questions of King Milinda gives us a delightful pen picture:

There is in the country of the Yonakas a great centre of trade, a city that is called Sangala, situated in a delightful country well watered and hilly, abounding in parks and gardens and groves and lakes and tanks, a paradise of rivers and mountains and woods. Wise architects have laid it out and its people know of no oppression, since all their enemies and adversaries have been put down. Brave is its defence, with many and various strong towers and ramparts, with superb gates and entrance archways, and with the royal citadel in its midst, white-walled and deeply moated. Well laid out are its streets, squares, cross-roads and market-places. Well displayed are the innumerable sorts of costly merchandise with which its shops are filled. It is richly adorned with hundreds of alms-

balls of various kinds, and splendid with hundreds of thousands of magnificent mansions, which rise aloft like the mountain peaks of the Himalayas. Its streets are filled with elephants, horses, carriages and foot passengers, and crowded by men of all sorts and conditions—Brahmans, nobles, artificers and servants. They resound with cries of welcome to the teachers of every creed, and the city is the resort of the leading men of each of the different sects.

We should indeed be thankful to the unknown Indian writer who lifts the veil of obscurity for a brief moment and reveals to us a glance of this outpost of Hellenism in distant India.

Menander was not content to remain at home for long. He led a great army into central India. Sweeping all before him he crossed the Son, and threatened Pataliputra, now the seat of Pushyamitra, the usurper who had driven out the last of the Mauryas. But Menander had to abandon his ambitious projects, owing, doubtless, to threats of attack by the Sacae. He and all his court were subsequently converted to Buddhism by the sage Nāgasena, and the Pali work from which we have quoted already records the disputations which



#### HELLENISTIC COINS OF THE DISTANT EAST, 250-150 B.C.

Even when entirely cut off from contact with the West the Greeks produced coins unsurpassed for beauty by anything minted in Greece and Sicily. Here (left to right) are coins of Diodotus of Bactria, Demetrius of India, wearing an elephant's scalp, Eucratides of Bactria in 'causia' or sun hat, and Menander of Sangala in the Punjab. The designs on the reverse depict respectively Zeus with thunderbolt, the young Heracles with club and lion skin, the Dioscuri charging and Pallas with aegis.

*From Gardner, Catalogue of Coins of Greek and Scythian Kings*



ROMAN COINS FROM SOUTHERN INDIA

The extent of trade between India and the Mediterranean world in Roman imperial times is attested by huge finds of Roman coins. These, from Pudukota, bear the image and superscription of Nero; note how they are mutilated.

British Museum

took place between the Indian teacher and the Yavana ('Ionian,' i.e., Greek) monarch.

After Menander, Greek rule in the Punjab gradually collapsed. The numerous petty Greek rulers, as their coins show, were gradually losing all traces of their Hellenic origin, and in the north-west they were displaced, first by Scythian and Pahlava (Parthian) invaders, and finally by a branch of the Yuch-chi, known as the Kushans. All these rulers had a considerable veneer of Greek culture, imported Greek craftsmen from Asia Minor to decorate the magnificent Buddhist stupas which they erected, and minted coins in imitation of Greek and Roman models.

The Kushan emperors were in close touch with Rome. One seems to have sent an embassy, to congratulate Augustus on his accession, in 25 B.C. It included a Buddhist monk, who ultimately burnt himself on a pyre at Athens, tigers (which were shown at the opening of the theatre of Marcellus), a gigantic python and a partridge as big as an eagle (really the monal pheasant from the Himalayas). It is noteworthy, as illustrating the difficulties of intercourse between East and West, that this queer cortège did not reach Augustus till 21 B.C., when it found

him at Samos. Another Kushan embassy, probably from Kadphises II, came to Trajan in A.D. 99. In A.D. 116 the eastern frontiers of Rome, under Hadrian, were only 600 miles from the western borders of the Kushan Empire. The collapse of the Kushans, and the simultaneous rise of the Sassanians in Persia, early in the third century A.D., put an end to the spread of Hellenism in the north-west of India and the adjoining countries.

Meanwhile, India was also coming into contact with the West through the flourishing sea-borne trade which had sprung up between the ports on the west coast and Alexandria. This commerce, which had been going on since the days of King Solomon (if we accept the identification of Ophir with Suppara near Bombay), received a great impetus from the enterprising policy of the Ptolemies. With the establishment of the 'Pax Romana,' the demand for luxuries from the East increased enormously. Indian silks, gems, cosmetics and spices, especially pepper, fetched almost incredible prices in Rome. These commodities were shipped from ports on the Malabar coast to Aden, from Aden to the Red Sea port of Myos Hormos (Mussel Harbour), and thence by the desert road to the Nile, where they were floated down to Alexandria. Alexandria thus became the emporium of the East.

Pliny bitterly complains of the 'drain' which this trade in Eastern luxuries inflicted: he estimates it at over a million pounds sterling per annum. This statement is supported by the huge finds of Roman coins which have been made from time to time in southern India, amounting to 'potfuls' and 'ooly loads' in many instances. It seems almost certain that there were at one time colonies of Roman merchants on the Malabar coast, at Muziris (Cranganore) and other places in southern India. An interesting little book, the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, written about A.D. 80 by an unknown Alexandrian sea-captain, gives details of the trade of the time. The voyage between India and Alexandria had been immensely shortened when about A.D. 45 Hippalus discovered the existence of the monsoons,

Sea-borne trade  
between East and West

which enabled ships to run straight across the Arabian Sea instead of creeping laboriously along the coast. It now took less than forty days to reach Aden from India, and two months to go to Alexandria.

We now come to an interesting question. To what extent, and in what direction, did Greek culture affect the various oriental states with which it came into contact? It must be remembered that Greek ideas were no novelty in western Asia at the time of Alexander's invasion. There had been flourishing Greek colonies all along the coast-line of Asia Minor for many centuries. Greek ambassadors and travellers had penetrated to the Persian capital at Susa; there had been Greek mercenaries and other officers in the pay of the Great King: one of them, Scylax, had visited India with Darius the Great in 510 B.C. From Marathon till the days of Alexander, Greek and Persian had fought and intrigued and negotiated. As early as the sixth century we find Asiatic rulers, like Croesus of Lydia, thoroughly Hellenic in their outlook.

Perhaps the event which brought Greece and Persia more into contact with one another than anything else, however,

was the expedition of the  
 True forerunner of Alexander    Ten Thousand under Xenophon in the year 401 B.C., which made the

famous march from the heart of Mesopotamia to Trapezus on the Euxine Sea. Xenophon was the true forerunner of Alexander. What Alexander did, then, was not so much to introduce any novel ideas into the Nearer East as to shift the centre of gravity of Greek culture from Greece to Asia, and to establish a new Magna Graecia in the Orient, comparable to that which had flourished for centuries in Sicily and Italy. The chief agents for the spread of Hellenism were the cities which he and his successors planted all over their dominions.

These cities never lost sight of their mother country; they sent representatives to the Great Games, and retained the old constitution of the city states of Greece. Thus an inscription from Antioch in Persia (Antiochia Margiana, the modern Merv) of 206 B.C. shows that this city had its Boulé, Ecclesia and magistrates.

The little kingdom of Pergamum was a 'city state' throughout its career: its Attalid rulers never interfered with its internal constitution. Seleucia on the Tigris, as late as the days of Tacitus, was 'proof against barbarian influences and mindful of its founder,' and produced Greek thinkers like Diogenes the Stoic and Berosus the historian. Such cities, with their temples, gymnasia, libraries and theatres, dotted about from the foothills of the Hindu Kush and the banks of the Jaxartes to the mouth of the Nile, were the centres for the spread of Hellenism.

Greek in the Seleucid Empire resembled, *mutatis mutandis*, English in India to-day. The 'Koine,' or common Greek dialect, like English in India,

was the official language, *Speech of the Seleucid Empire* and was affected by the upper classes, among

whom a veneration of Greek culture was fashionable, partly, no doubt, because it opened the door to government service. Doubtless, too, the substitution of Greek for the babel of Asiatic dialects, and of the neat Greek script for the clumsy cuneiform, had far-reaching effects upon commerce and national life. Pliny notes the radical change which overtook the village life of Mesopotamia when the new centres of population set up by the foundation of Greek cities broke in upon it; and the well known story how, after the disaster of Carthage, an actor came upon the stage holding the head of Crassus and declaiming the famous lines from the Bacchae of Euripides, shows how deeply the Hellenic spirit had penetrated into even an intensely nationalistic and anti-Hellenic nation like Parthia. Later on, we shall see how the Greeks of Bactria and the Punjab, though entirely cut off for centuries from contact with the West, produced a series of coins unsurpassed for beauty by anything minted in Greece and Sicily. The vitality of Hellenism is its most amazing characteristic. It was not mere caprice that led the Seleucids finally to prefer as their capital Antioch on the Orontes, looking westward to the mother country, to Seleucia in the heart of Asia.

One of the most momentous consequences of the Hellenisation of the East was the spread of Christianity all over the



#### CHAMPION OF BACTRIAN INDEPENDENCE

Euthydemus I superseded Diodotus in the rule of Bactria and in 208 B.C. secured recognition of his independence from Antiochus of Syria. This Hellenic bust, showing him wearing the 'causia' or sun hat, probably dates from that time.

*From Delbrück, Antike Porträts*

western world, and its ultimate acceptance as the official religion of the Roman Empire and, ultimately, of modern Europe. Alexander the Great had always favoured the Jews, and no state became Hellenised more quickly than Judaea. The Hasmonaeans (the successors of Judas Macabaeus) and, later, the Herods, were entirely Greek in their outlook on life. Jerusalem, with its theatres and gymnasia, had all the appearance of a Greek city. Jewish young men of the upper classes spoke Greek and dressed like Greeks; the Old Testament had to be translated into Greek for the Hellenised Jews of Alexandria, and patriotic Jewish writers like Philo and Josephus actually chose this language as their medium.

The teachings of Our Lord were, it is true, entirely Hebraic in character, and were probably delivered in Aramaic. But Jesus must have known Greek and spoken in Greek to the Pharisees and to foreign officials like Pontius Pilate, and a significant story is recorded in S. John's gospel how, when certain Greeks wished to

speak to Him, He prophetically exclaimed, 'The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified.' 'The hour cometh,' He told the woman of Samaria, 'when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.'

It was the 'Koinê,' or Greek 'lingua franca,' which made the Gospels accessible to educated people all over the world, just as it was the genius of S. Paul, steeped in Greek philosophy at the university of Tarsus, which recast Christianity on the lines of western thought. Greek, as Dr. Mahaffy points out, was the current language of early Christianity, and the Septuagint was the version commonly used in quotations. S. Paul, in his speeches and writings to Greek audiences, deliberately endeavours to place Christianity and Stoic philosophy side by side, and, as Milton said, 'thought it no defilement to bring into holy scripture the sentences of three Greek poets.' In the first chapter of S. John, verses 1-6, we are reminded of the marriage of Christianity and Greek philosophy in the identification of the Incarnate Christ with the Logos, or Divine Intelligence. In architecture, the



#### GRAECO-INDIAN CURRENCY

Apart from the extraordinary realism of the portrait the silver coin of Antimachus (left) is notable for the palm-bearing Poseidon on the reverse, commemorating some naval victory on the Indus. Non-Hellenic elements appear in the later coinage of Azes and his successors,

*British Museum*

fine arts and in coinage we find abundant traces of the Hellenisation of western Asia from Ctesiphon to Baalbek and Palmyra. Hellenism continued to be a living force in Asia until the beginning of the third century A.D., when it was swept away in the Zoroastrian revival of Ardashir.

We may next turn to the puzzling problem of the influence of Hellenism in Bactria and India. Of the brilliant but short-lived kingdom of Bactria proper, we know hardly anything except what we may glean from the coins, since, so far, archaeological work at Balkh and the neighbourhood has been rendered almost impossible by the disturbed state of the country. Foucher's visit added little to our knowledge. But the

Bactrian culture coins, unless they are, as shown by coins W. W. Tarn maintains, a 'sport,' an outburst of sporadic genius from the hand of an unknown artist, are a proof of a very high level of culture (see page 1497). Beyond the Hindu Kush, the leaven of Hellenism is far less pronounced. Alexander's invasion had little more effect than the countless other invasions which, from time immemorial, have come pouring through the Khyber, and all traces of it were swept away by Chandragupta before 317 B.C. :

The East bowed down before the blast,  
In patient, deep disdain :  
She let the legions thunder past,  
And plunged in thought again.

The Mauryan court was, however, distinctly cosmopolitan. Chandragupta had been brought up in Taxila, and had come into contact with Persian, if not Greek, influence to a considerable extent. We have already spoken of the intimate connexion between the Seleucid and Mauryan kingdoms—a connexion that was shown by the presence of a Greek princess and her entourage and of ambassadors at the court of Chandragupta, of Bindusara's naïve request to his Greek neighbour for the loan of a sophist, and of Asoka's Buddhist mission to his brother princes of the West. But, for all this, the Mauryan court remained predominantly Persian, not Greek. The elaborate ceremonial, the autocratic government depicted by Megas-



#### INDIAN PUNCH-MARKED COINS


In contrast with the foreign coins current in India in the Maurya period, the indigenous coins were very crude. They were unsymmetrical in form, and the symbols punch-marked indiscriminately on their surface had no artistic merit.

*From Gardner, Catalogue of Coins of Greek and Scythian Kings*

thenes and in Kautilya's Artha Sastra, the architecture of the capital as revealed by excavations, the lion-pillars, Asoka's long inscriptions on the face of the rock (see pages 1215-16), the Royal Road—all these are Persian, not Hellenic in spirit. The Mauryas borrowed from ancient Babylon and Susa, not from Antioch or Balkh. Even in his mints, Asoka was content with the punch-marked coins of his predecessors and heedless of the fine specimens from Bactria which must have circulated freely in his Empire.

The period when Greek influence really made itself felt in India was after the break up of the Maurya dynasty, when the Bactrian Greeks were settled at Sangala, and the Sakas, Pahlavas, Kushans and other semi-Hellenised tribes from central Asia held sway on the North-West Frontier.

The most interesting question which arises in this connexion is the influence of Hellenism upon Indian art. This is particularly noticeable in the case of sculpture. Before the coming of the Greeks, the Buddhists had refrained from depicting the Master in human form. He is represented only by symbols—the Lotus, the Umbrella, the Wheel of the Law, his footprints and so forth (see Chap. 40). It was from Greek artisans, during the Scytho-Parthian supremacy, that the so-called Gandhara school of Indian sculpture arose, innumerable examples of which have been found all over the North-West Frontier, especially in the Peshawar district, and are now collected in the galleries of the Lahore Museum. Readers of Kim



# INFLUENCE OF HELLENISM UPON INDIAN ART MANIFESTED IN SCULPTURE

The oldest known example of Indo-Hellenic sculpture in the Punjab is the statuette dating from about the beginning of the Christian era, of Pallas Athena (centre), in purely Greek style. A striking specimen is the figure (left) of a throned Indo-Scythian king, with his left foot on a footstool, and his left hand clasping a spear. As the result of Greek influence, too, the Buddhists began to make images of Buddha, whom previously they had represented only by symbols, and in the so-called Gandhara school of sculpture the Blessed One is often figured, as on the right, attended by a spirit acolyte.

*Lahore Museum and (right) Museum für Völkerkunde, Berlin*



From the ancient kingdom of Gandhara—now the district of Peshawar—come numerous limestone figures in which Western influence is very obvious. Save for the exaggerated ear lobe the head (right) of the central statue below is almost purely Greek. The small head (bottom centre) might almost be a Greek Eros; and in the other two, Greek coiffure is blent with the Indo-Bactrian type of head.

*Louvre and Worcester Museum, U.S.A.*



Western technique applied to oriental themes produced in the earlier Graeco-Buddhist sculpture a remarkable hybrid art. In the Bodhisattva (right)—a potential Buddha, who has not yet attained full enlightenment—and in the Gandhara Buddha (centre) the treatment of the drapery is very reminiscent of the classic Pheidias school (left). But despite this and the Greek sandals the Bodhisattva wears Indian head-dress and Indian ornaments.

#### **BUDDHIST ADAPTATIONS COMPARED WITH A CLASSIC PROTOTYPE**

*Berlin State Museum (left), Louvre (right), and Worcester, U.S.A. (centre)*





#### VIVACIOUS FIGURES ON A GANDHARA FRIEZE

In face the figures on this fragment of frieze from Gandhara are occidental rather than oriental; but Western influence on the work is even more obvious in the variety and animation of the composition as a whole. In early Graeco-Buddhist sculpture the torso is frequently left undraped.

*Worcester Art Museum, U.S.A.*

will remember how powerfully the old lama was affected by the sight of these entrancing works of art. In them, not only does the Buddha appear in the guise of the Greek Apollo (assuming for the first time the form in which, conventionalised and modified, he is traditionally represented all over the East to-day), but scenes from the Jātakas, or Birth Stories, are treated with the greatest animation and originality.

It was from Greece that the use of images, perhaps also of temples, passed into Buddhism and Hinduism. Modern nationalist opinion in India is unfortunately prejudiced against the 'bastard' school of Indo-Greek Buddhist sculpture, which became more and more pronouncedly Indian and less Greek in style as time went on. It reached its culminating point under Kanishka, the greatest of the Kushan kings (perhaps about A.D. 120).



#### UNIQUE INSCRIBED PEDESTAL OF A GANDHARA STATUE

Peculiar interest attaches to this pedestal of a statue of Buddha, since it carries the only known epigraphic evidence as to the accurate dating of any work of the Gandhara school of sculpture. It is of blue slate and on the front is an alto-relievo enclosed between two Indo-Corinthian pilasters and representing a seated Buddha receiving offerings from disciples. On a smooth band below the relief is an inscription containing the number 274, equivalent to A.D. 352.

*Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*


At the same time archaeologists have found abundant traces of Greek workmanship in the buildings erected during the period, especially in the neighbourhood of Taxila. Here the ornamentation of the Buddhist stupas is Corinthian, with Indian motifs, and the temples are characterised by Ionic columns and classical mouldings. Greek objects d'art, such as engraved gems, seals, statuettes and the like, either imported from Asia Minor or made by local craftsmen from Greek models, are found in large numbers. One ceramic fragment depicts a scene from the Antigone. Bacchic motifs are common, Krishna being identified with Dionysus by the Greeks. The famous gilt reliquary of Kanishka, containing ashes of the Buddha, which was dug up near Peshawar, was, as the inscription informs us, the gift of a Greek overseer named Agesilaos. It is shaped like a Greek lady's jewel-case, and the frieze of flying swans and 'amorini' is Greek, though the inscription is in Prakrit.



#### REALISM INFORMED WITH HUMOUR

The Gandhara sculptors were not without their sense of humour. In their representations of demons they often display keen enjoyment of the grotesque and in some of their portrayals of monks and Brahmans a rich gift of caricature.

*British Museum*




#### KANISHKA'S COPPER-GILT RELIQUARY FOR BUDDHA'S ASHES

Gandhara art was highly developed under the Kushan king Kanishka (c. A.D. 78)—witness this reliquary from a stupa founded by him. It is a circular pyx of copper gilt; on the lid is a figure of the Buddha seated between Brahma and Indra. Around the pyx is a ring of flying swans set above a frieze in the Greek manner showing three Buddhas seated in the loops of a garland held by amorini.

*From Foucher, 'L'art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhara'*



Excavation outside Taxila has brought to light an Ionic temple of the first century B.C., built probably for fire worshippers. In general plan it resembled the ordinary Greek temple but had a wall pierced by large windows at its sides and back instead of the usual colonnade. Taxila was the great Buddhist 'university town,' and capital of the Saka and Parthian kings of the Punjab.



Miles of ruins, near the modern Rawalpindi, now represent the once great city of Taxila which submitted to Alexander after he crossed the Indus and where he paused to refresh his troops before marching to crush Porus on the farther bank of the Hydaspes. Most imposing of the Buddhist monuments unearthed here or elsewhere in the Punjab is this 'Great Stupa of the Royal Law' erected in the first century B.C. and set about by many shrines and chapels.

#### MONUMENTS OF EARLY NORTH-WEST INDIAN CULTURE

*Courtesy of Sir John Marshall, Director-General of Archaeology in India*

The Kushans were responsible for the diffusion of Hellenistic influence in another direction. On the north their empire stretched over the Pamirs, and included parts of Khotan, Yarkand and Kashgar. There they came into collision with the Chinese, and from this period we may date the beginning of the intercourse between Buddhist India and China. Through this channel also Hellenistic art penetrated into the heart of central Asia. Seal impressions of the Athena and Eros types were found in the buried cities of Khotan by Sir Aurel Stein, and that region, now a waterless desert, was, in the early part of the Christian era, the meeting-place of four great civilizations—Graeco-Roman, Iranian, Indian and Chinese.

Buddhism spread to China about the year A.D. 61, when the Buddha is said to have appeared to the Emperor of China in a dream. There was considerable intercourse between the Chinese and the




GOLD COINS OF KANISHKA

Kanishka, greatest of the Kushan emperors, reigned at Peshawar probably about A.D. 120. Here he is figured in Turki costume; the inscription is in Khotanese, in modified Greek characters. On the reverse is an Indo-Iranian deity. The coin agrees in weight with the Roman 'aureus.'

*British Museum*

semi-Hellenic court of the Kushans at Peshawar, the home of Gandhara art, during the following century. The introduction of Buddhism into China was followed by a steady stream of Chinese pilgrims to places associated with the life of the Master, and Chinese savants went to study at the Indian universities of Nalanda and Taxila. They brought back



## HYBRID ART AND CULTURE OF INDIA UNDER PARTHIAN KINGS

Antiquities unearthed at Sirkap, the Parthian city outside Taxila, show that the culture of north-west India under the Parthian kings was rather Greek than Indian. The bronze statuette of Harpocrates (left) is definitely Greek. Hellenistic, too, are the intaglio (top centre, with impression) of carnelian set in gold, with figures of Eros and Psyche, and the gold necklace below inlaid with crystal, lapis-lazuli, turquoise and white paste. The Dionysus (right) is in silver repoussé.

*Courtesy of Sir John Marshall, Director-General of Archaeology in India*



#### BUDDHIST BANNERS FROM TUN HUANG

In the Caves of the Thousand Buddhas at Tun Huang Sir Aurel Stein discovered a rich treasure of Buddhist pictorial art of the T'ang period. These temple banners are painted on strips of fine gauze-like silk, in a style in which Indian traditions are modified by Chinese influence.

*From Stein, 'Desert Cathay,' by permission of the India Office*

with them, as we learn from the records of the Chinese travellers, relics in the shape of statuettes and images of the Buddha, and these were reproduced by Chinese artisans. The earliest Buddhist bronzes in China belong to the end of the fourth century after Christ, and Chinese Buddhist art began about one hundred years later. To this period—the time of the Wai dynasty—belong the grottoes of Tun Huang in Chinese Turkistan, with their interesting statues and mural paintings, which are obviously far more akin to Gandhara than to Gupta forms of art. In the words of a distinguished scholar, 'Greek influence, in the last centuries B.C.

and the first centuries of our era, had extended to Chinese Turkistan with Buddhist art, and then finally reached China proper, and the last ripples of the waves of Greek influence had been felt even on the shores of the Pacific Ocean.' We have E. B. Havell's authority for saying that closely guarded in the oldest temples in Japan are paintings bearing a strong resemblance to Gandhara workmanship.

To sum up, it may be safely asserted that the cosmopolitan Graeco-Roman art of Asia Minor certainly infused new life into India. Indian craftsmen learnt from their Greek confrères new methods of tackling technical difficulties. But the profound temperamental difference between the Indian and Greek mind prevented Greek art from ever exercising a lasting influence. The Greek gods and goddesses are glorified human beings; the Indian god is an attempt to express in terms of art a metaphysical conception. The coins of the Kushans, with their strange jumble of Greek, Indian and Zoroastrian deities and their Saka legends written in Greek characters, illustrate admirably the cosmopolitan culture of north-western India at the time.

Otherwise, the influence of Greece on India was comparatively slight. It was confined to the foreign races of the Punjab, and

to a limited period. Even here, it is noteworthy that not a single Greek inscription has been found, though it is possible, to judge from the coins, that a corrupt Greek dialect was spoken by the descendants of the Bactrian invaders in the Punjab until they were absorbed in the native population. How rapidly that took place may be seen from the Besnagar pillar, the solitary extant monument of the Bactrian Greeks which has come down to us. This was erected by the Yavana ambassador Heliodorus, son of Dion, of Taxila, a follower of Vishnu, in honour of Krishna-Vasudeva. This is significant; as early as 140 B.C. we find a Greek who

is a Hindu by religion, and who erects a monument without a trace of Greek workmanship in honour of a Hindu god. The tendency was for the Greeks to become Indianised, rather than for the Hindus to become Hellenised. Hinduism has always shown a wonderful power of absorbing and assimilating foreign elements.

The resemblances between Homer and the Indian epics, the Greek and Sanskrit drama, Platonism and the Vedanta philosophy and the like, of which much has been made from time to time, are vague and unsatisfactory when strictly investigated, and rest on a very slender basis, literary or historical. The same may be said of the so-called parallels between the Gita and the Gospels, Buddhist and Christian ethics, and the birth-stories of Krishna or Buddha and Christ. In one respect, however, India frankly acknowledged her indebtedness to Greece. 'The Yavanas are barbarians,' says the author of the



HELLENISTIC CHINESE SCULPTURE

Buddhism spreading eastward carried with it Gandhara works of art which undoubtedly influenced Chinese Buddhist art in its beginnings about the fifth century of our era. To this period belongs this head of a Chinese Bodhisattva modelled in sandstone and once coloured.



#### WESTERN ART FORMS ON THE FRINGE OF THE FAR EAST

The far eastward spread of Hellenic art is strikingly exemplified in the frescoes found in a temple at Miran on the confines of true China. The draperies in the frieze (right) representing Gautama teaching a princely worshipper are classical in treatment and the head-dress suggests Bactrian affinities. Even more remarkable is the dado of winged angels (left) obviously derived from the Eros of Greek myth.

*From Sir Aurel Stein, 'Ruins of Desert Cathay,' by permission of the India Office*



#### CLASSICAL ART IN CHINESE TURKISTAN

The grotesque head (bottom centre) is definitely derived from the classical Gorgon's head; the satyr (bottom right) from Roman and Hellenistic models. The classical type is equally obvious in the heads above and especially in the central Bodhisattva. All come from Kara-Shahr in Chinese Turkistan.

*From Sir Aurel Stein, 'Ruins of Desert Cathay'*

Sanskrit astronomical work, the Gargi Samhita, 'yet the science of astronomy originated with them, and for this they

the Romans once, in later editions.

Special efforts have been made to connect the Hindu 'nāṭaka' with the Greek

must be revered as gods.' Of the five Siddhantas, or Sanskrit systems of astronomy, two, the Paulisa (named after Paul of Alexandria, A.D. 378) and the Romaka, are of undoubted western origin.

A certain number of Greek words found their way into Sanskrit. Some of these, like 'meridarch' (meridarches, 'governor of a province,' a word used by Josephus), occur only in the Taxila district. Others, like 'jamitra' (diametron) and 'trikona' (trigonos), are astronomical, or like 'kastira' (kassiteros), 'dām' (drachma), 'dinar' (denarius, Latin) are connected with commerce. 'Barbaran' (barbaros) is found in the Mahabharata, the latest recension of which was about A.D. 300. The Greeks are mentioned several times, and



#### BLEND OF GRAECO-INDIAN AND CHINESE ART AT TUN HUANG

Situated near the main trade routes between West and East, Tun Huang in outer Kansu was equally accessible to both Graeco-Buddhist and Chinese Buddhist influence. The hundreds of shrines known as the Caves of the Thousand Buddhas are extraordinarily rich in frescoes and stucco sculptures. Almost all the shrines contain groups like the above representing Buddha between disciples.

*From Sir Aurel Stein, 'Ruins of Desert Cathay,' by permission of the India Office*

drama. It was contended that 'strolling players' from Greece must surely have acted at the court of a cultured monarch like the Bactrian Menander, as they did at the court of the Ptolemies in Alexandria and of the Parthian kings at Ctesiphon; Ujjain (the Greek Ozené), one of the earliest centres of the Sanskrit drama, was, as we know from the *Periplus*, connected by a direct route with Broach (Barygaza), the chief port of trade with Alexandria, and one of the imports was 'Greek girls' (the Yavani or Ionian girls of the Sanskrit plays) for the royal harems; the 'Greek curtain' (Yavanikā) was used on the Hindu stage; the Greek 'chorodidaskalos' (chorus-master) is the Indian 'sūtra dhāra'; and there are many features, for instance the 'Vidushakha,' or Pimp, and the Parasite or Miles Gloriosus, common to the Hindu drama and the new Attic comedy.

But none of these arguments bears close scrutiny. There is no evidence to prove that Greek players attempted the weary and perilous journey across the Hindu Kush to Sangala, and actors are not mentioned by the author of the *Questions* in his long catalogue of the features of the capital; the Yavani of the Sanskrit plays are Amazons forming the royal bodyguard, not actresses; the so-called 'Greek curtain' was merely made of imported material (Coan silk or the like), and not borrowed from the Greek stage; the resemblance of the Vidushakha to the Pimp is no stranger than his resemblance to the Shakesperian clown; and, in a word, equally close (and equally fortuitous) parallels might be found between the Elizabethan and Hindu stages. 'If one imagines that the Greek theatre exercised any influence on the formation of the Indian drama,' says Professor Pischel, it shows an ignorance both of the Greek theatre and of the Indian theatre.'

We have now concluded our survey of the influence of Hellenism upon India and the East. Is it possible also to trace any reflex action upon Hellenism on the part of the Orient? Did the Greeks and Romans themselves absorb anything from the Oriental nations with whom they came into contact? This is an interesting problem. We know nothing of the fate



#### EASTERN ABSORPTION OF THE WEST

India's power of absorbing foreign elements is illustrated by this column at Beunagar erected by Heliodorus of Taxila in honour of Krishna. The only extant monument of the Bactrian Greeks, it shows no trace of Greek workmanship.

*From the Cambridge Ancient History of India*

of the Buddhist mission which Asoka dispatched to the West, and attempts to trace Buddhist influences in early Christianity are mere guesses. Nor is there any foundation for the later stories which were told about supposed visits of Pythagoras and Plato to India. The Greeks heard a good deal about the 'Gymnosophists' of India from Megasthenes and others, but they were in no way impressed by their teaching. Greek exclusiveness despised 'barbarian' ideas as foolish and meaningless, and regarded them merely as curiosities. Indeed, it



would not be easy for an outsider to penetrate the closely guarded arcana of Vedic learning even had he tried to do so. Whether the Buddhist monk who burnt himself at Athens in 21 B.C. preached the Law to the Athenians we cannot say; no doubt the members of the Areopagus would have treated him with the same derision that they meted out to S. Paul.

But at a later period India and Greece came into closer contact in the cosmopolitan porticoes of Alexandria. Plotinus, with his pantheism and his mystic union with the Infinite, is obviously steeped in Vedanta and Yoga philosophy. The same is true in a less pronounced degree of writers like Origen. Oriental influence upon the development of Christianity is a theme which would require a chapter to itself. The strange craze for the ascetic life, which drove hundreds of hermits like S. Anthony (A.D. 356) out into the Libyan desert, and caused others to indulge in repulsive forms of penance, like S. Simon Stylites, may be traced directly to the Indian Yogi. To India also, perhaps, we may attribute the introduction of the rosary and the adoration of relics, and perhaps some of those details of ritual which so startled the

good Abbé Huc when he visited Lhasa in 1842. 'The crozier, the mitre, the chasuble,' he writes, 'the double choir at the Divine Office, the chants, the exorcism, the censer with five chains, the blessing which the Lamas impart by extending the right hand over the faithful, the rosary, the celibacy of the clergy, their separation from the world, the worship of Saints, the fasts, processions, litanies, holy water—these are the points of contact which the Buddhists have with us.' Whether the borrowing was from Buddhism to Christianity or vice versa is an open question.

One curious example of the influence of Buddhism on Christianity is afforded by the story of Barlaam and Josaphat. This narrative is ostensibly the story of the conversion to Christianity of a young Indian prince, written by S. John Damascene about A.D. 750. But closer examination shows that Josaphat is no other than the Bodhisattva, and the whole theme is borrowed from that of the early life and

subsequent conversion of Gautama Buddha! The Gnostic heresy, which arose partly at Alexandria and partly at Antioch, in the second century A.D., obviously owes a great deal, especially its dualism—the Eternal Conflict between Light and Darkness—to Zoroastrianism. Manichæism, that strange farrago of Christian, Zoroastrian and Hindu beliefs, arose in the neighbourhood of Babylon in the sixth century A.D. Mithraism (see Chap. 74), one of the most formidable of the early rivals of Christianity which pervaded the Roman Empire right up to the Great Wall of Britain, and undoubtedly influenced the development of Christian doctrine, was of Persian origin. And lastly, strange Oriental deities, Cybele, Attis, Adonis, Astarte, Osiris and Isis, crept stealthily into the Graeco-Roman pantheon.

In one other respect Hellenism made itself felt in the East. The Mahomedan conquerors of the Byzantine Empire, as will be shown in Chapter 97, owed much of their

Arabic indebtedness to Greek influence

culture to Greek sources. Aristotle was early translated into Arabic and became the foundation stone of Arabian philosophy; it was through Latin translations of the Arabic version, curiously enough, that he was known to medieval Europe. Similarly, it was from Hippocrates and Galen that the Arabic schools of medicine took their rise. Chaucer, in the amusing account of medieval medicine which he gives in his Prologue, mentions, besides Hippocrates and Galen, Rufus of Ephesus, of the age of Trajan, and Dioscorides, a Greek physician of the second century, as the founders of the science. From these the earliest masters of Arabian medicine, John of Damascus, Avicenna (Ibn Sina), Rhazes and Averroes (Ibn Roshd) derived the knowledge which they handed on to the European doctors of the middle ages. The Arabic indebtedness to Greece in mathematics and geography is equally profound.

From the time of the Macedonian conquest of the middle East, the influence of Greek culture may be traced almost all over Asia, and it is difficult to find any branch of art or literature where its effect has not been felt.

# THE CELTIC PEOPLES: THEIR CULTURE AND THEIR TRAGEDY

An Account of the interesting Folk who formed the  
Barbaric Background to Greek and Roman Civilization

By R. A. S. MACALISTER

Professor of Celtic Archaeology, University College, Dublin; Author of A Text-book of  
European Archaeology, Ireland in pre-Celtic Times, etc.

THE word 'Celtic' in the heading of this chapter is one of the most difficult to define in the whole range of anthropological or historical literature. The word was used by ancient Greek and Latin writers as a label by which they denoted certain peoples of central and northern Europe. Whence they derived it is unknown; they may have learnt it from some of the folk whom they thus designated; but the word has no certain etymology in any of the existing Celtic languages. As used by the classical writers in question, it cannot be maintained that it had any exact scientific connotation; at best it was a vague geographical term, conveniently standing for the barbarians (as they were considered) of a certain area of the Continent, but in no respect defining them racially or linguistically.

In modern literature the word is almost equally vague, except in the department of philology. The languages called 'Celtic' are distinguished from the other members of the Indo-European family of languages by certain definite peculiarities. It is needless here to enumerate all of them; we may mention one or two only.

In a normally constructed sentence the verb holds the first place—not the last, as is usual in Latin. The initial consonants of words combined in a sentence undergo certain euphonic modifications, which considerably increase the learner's difficulty in recognizing them when he hears them uttered in rapid speech. The letter 'p' of the parent speech, from which all the Indo-European tongues are derived, is dropped, just as a Cockney drops his aitches. For example, the old Indo-European word for 'boy' or 'descendant' was

'pavios.' The Greeks elided the letter 'v' between vowels, so that they made of this word their regular word for boy, 'pais.' The Celts dropped the 'p,' making 'avios,' which in time submitted to further simplification within the history of the Celtic languages themselves, and ultimately degenerated into the 'O' prefixed to certain Irish surnames, such as O'Brien or O'Connor (the apostrophe in such names is not an indication of something omitted, but is merely a misunderstanding of a mark of prolongation over the vowel). 'O' is therefore exactly the same word as 'pais.'

The languages thus distinguished fall into two classes, called Goidelic and Brythonic. The Goidelic languages retain the original Indo-European 'qu' sound, though with a tendency to simplify it into a 'c' or 'k'; the Brythonic languages change the same sound into a 'p.' Thus 'quennos,' the Indo-European word for head, becomes in the Goidelic languages 'cenn,' in the Brythonic 'pen.' The modern Goidelic languages are the Gaelic of Ireland, the Scottish Highlands and the Isle of Man; all three are so closely cognate that they may be regarded as dialects of one tongue rather than three separate languages. In the Isle of Man, where the language is moribund, its essential similarity to the languages of the other two countries is concealed by an absurd would-be phonetic spelling. The Brythonic languages are Welsh and its near cognates, Breton and the extinct Cornish.

Materials for the study of ancient forms of these languages exist in the early inscriptions of the Continental Celts (the

Classes of  
Celtic speech




only records of the Continental Celtic languages that have survived, except a few scattered proper names and other words preserved by classical writers); the early inscriptions of Great Britain and Ireland, especially those in the Ogham character; and the ancient literatures of Ireland and Wales. The Breton language of France is to be grouped with the Insular Celtic languages, not with the Continental, as it was the tongue of a colony from Britain, founded by Celts driven out before the advancing Saxons.

If we turn from this clearly defined group of languages, and analyse the racial peculiarities of the people who speak them, we find ourselves involved in utter confusion. Tall and fair people, short and dark people, pass before us, all of them with seemingly equal claims to be the true and original Celts. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that there are as many different racial types among the Celtic speakers as there are among the inhabitants of the whole of Europe. Caesar, for instance, tells us that the Celts, Belgae and Aquitani differed in language, institutions and laws; while on the other hand he sees no difference between the Gauls and the Germans except in customs. On the other hand Strabo, writing at the end of the first century B.C., notes a difference between the Gauls and the Germans in physical character, the latter being taller and fairer, but a similarity in manners. A number of inconsistencies of the same kind might be collected, tending to show that the ancient writers were but superficial observers, and that their classification of peoples as 'Celtic' was not rigorously scientific; it was a mere label, and probably included scattered tribes here and there that were not Celtic in any real sense at all.

The Gauls who sacked Rome are described as having been tall, with fair or red hair, and white bodies which were soft and easily fatigued; though

impetuous in attack they soon wearied. This description, once established, was vaguely taken as the stock description of all the European Celts. In reading it we must not forget that it was written by Italians, a people dark by the nature of their race and by the action of their sun; and that it referred to strangers coming from the cold North into the enervating heat of Italy, in which they naturally soon wearied. Those who, like Tacitus in the second century A.D., came into direct contact with the Celtic people observed that they were not racially homogeneous. Tacitus distinguishes three types in Britain: the large-limbed, red-haired Caledonii, the ruddy-faced, curly-haired Silures, and the dwellers on the south coast of England, who resembled the Gauls.



#### CELTIC WORDS IN OGHAM CHARACTERS

Devised in Ireland for inscribing on stone, the Ogham alphabet consisted of straight lines and dots. Two ancient Gaelic names are carved in Ogham on one edge of the Llywell stone from Breconshire (left); the great monolith at Crag in Kerry (right) bears a similar inscription, a tracing of which is shown above.

*From British Museum and Macalister, 'Irish Epigraphy'*

The writers of classical antiquity differ as widely on the moral as on the racial qualities of the Gauls, and they show about the same qualifications for forming a judgement as Jean Jacques Rousseau, with his eulogy of the noble savage, or Artemus Ward, with his 'Injuns is pizen, wherever found.' Caesar and Livy describe them as being above all things religious; Cicero denies that they possess any feeling of piety and justice. Polybius says that they are perfidious; Strabo says that they have a simple

**Confused ideas of Celtic traits** and open nature, devoid of guile. Pausanias extols the strategical skill of their leader when they attacked Delphi; Strabo says that they fought with courage, but without military ruses. Diodorus speaks of their being inordinately fond of gold; Athenaeus asserts that some of them allowed no gold to enter their country. Some say that they were hospitable to strangers; Diodorus says that Heracles abolished among them the custom of sacrificing strangers. Cato declares that the Gauls of Gallia Cisalpina cultivated two arts with success—the art of war and the art of speaking. Polybius admits their skill in war, and also in agriculture, which Cato does not mention; but he denies that they possess any other art. Diodorus tells us that the Gauls of Gallia Transalpina had an affectation for expressing themselves in enigmas, leaving it to the skill of their hearer to divine their meaning; Strabo apparently did not succeed in this mental exercise, for he says that they were silly and senseless.

In short, the word 'Celtic,' as a racial term, is devoid of scientific meaning; if it is used at all to denote communities of people, it must be employed in the strictly geographical sense given to it by ancient writers, or else as a convenient generic label for the Celtic-speaking peoples.

This, however, is not a complete statement of the case. The parent language of the Celtic group must have developed in some single, probably isolated, community, which we may presume to have had a certain racial uniformity. If we can find a place of origin, and determine the racial characters of its inhabitants in early times, then it is legitimate to regard those

characters as distinguishing the original Celtic people. The French scholar D'Arbois de Jubainville has endeavoured to find such a place of origin, and he has fixed it in the region between the head-waters of the Rhine and those of the Danube. The reason for this choice is as follows.

It is to be observed in most countries that the names of rivers are usually the oldest topographical terms on the map. It often happens that river names are unintelligible, while the names of the places past which they flow—towns, villages, homesteads, rocks, mountains and so forth—are explicable with the help of languages still spoken, or known to have been spoken, in the neighbourhood. The river names are the sole survivors of yet older, prehistoric languages.

D'Arbois argues that if a territory can be found in which the river names are predominantly Celtic, then that territory is the place where the Celtic languages were aboriginal. The region named above satisfies the conditions. If

this be granted, we must **Homeland of** regard the short, stocky, Celtic folk moderately dark complexioned, broad-headed Alpine man as the racial Celt: a conclusion which leads us to the paradoxical result that Ireland, to-day the most enthusiastically Celtic of countries, contains only a very moderate Celtic element in her population, and that many of the inhabitants of certain parts of 'Saxon' England are of Celtic blood.

At the time when the Celtic language was in process of formation, Europe must have been occupied by a large number of small scattered communities, in the Neolithic stage of culture, separated each from the others by belts of forest land, and speaking a babel of different tongues, very few of them belonging to the Indo-European family. The ancestors of the Celtic-speakers must for a long time have lived in close connexion with the people who formed the Italian branch of tongues, of which Latin is the best known representative; for among the Indo-European families of languages, the Italian branch is that which comes most nearly into relationship with the Celtic family. After these had hived off, the Celts seem to have begun a career of conquest through the

regions of Europe north of the Alps, subduing one by one the small aboriginal communities; forcing their language, religion and culture upon them, but affecting their racial qualities very little.

The history of the spread of the Celtic languages over Europe is very imperfectly known. Place names, from Nerto-briga, 'the strong hill,' in Spain, to Noviodunum, 'the new fortress,' in Rumania, testify to their former wide extension: the map of Europe is strewn all over with Celtic wreckage. Stray scraps of information may be gleaned from various Greek and Roman writers; but they are only scraps, and are not above suspicion in the matter of trustworthiness.

The Greeks were fairly well acquainted with the Mediterranean coast, with which they had direct intercourse; but their information about the geography of central and northern Europe was

quite exiguous. Aristotle seems to have imagined that

the Danube rises in the Pyrenees; Strabo thought that the Caspian Sea opened into the Northern Ocean. The word 'Celt,' used by writers such as these, resembles the word 'Austrian' as we were wont to use it unthinkingly in the days before the Great War, to denote all citizens of the Austrian empire, whether they were Germans, Magyars or Slavs.

Plato speaks of the Celts as being warlike, in spite of their fondness for strong drink. Aristotle recommends as worthy of imitation their practice of hardening the physique of their children by clothing them in a light wrapper only during cold weather; but he is less sympathetic to their excessive fearlessness, shown by the fact that they had no terror of earthquakes or of waves. Strabo quotes (but with characteristic incredulity) the statement of Ephorus to the effect that their youths were punished if they allowed themselves to become too fat to wear a certain girdle; from another authority, unnamed, he derives the information that they were so intrepid that if their houses were washed away by the sea they rebuilt them on the same place.

But it is from a writer of the end of the second century B.C., Poseidonius of Apamea, that we obtain our fullest infor-



#### CELTIC RAIDERS INTO ITALY

During the third century B.C. Etruria was continually harried by predatory Celtic tribes, who are vividly represented in fragments of an Etruscan frieze. These two Gauls have both dropped looted articles on turning to confront a foe

*From Rostkoff, 'Rome,' Clarendon Press*

mation as to the social life of the Gauls. It is much to be regretted that the book in which he described his travels is lost, with the rest of his numerous writings; the fragments which survive—quotations embedded in the works of more fortunate but less deserving authors such as Athenaeus, Strabo and Diodorus of Sicily—show us what a heavy loss this is. He was evidently a man of kindly and sympathetic nature, and a good observer.


His travels included Gaul, and apparently extended to Belerion, that is, to Cornwall. He notes that the inhabitants of Britain dwelt in unpretentious houses, for the greater part of reeds and of wood. Their manner of life was simple and they knew nothing of the luxury born of riches.

Speaking of Gaul, Poseidonius tells us how the rivers are frozen in winter, and how it was the custom to spread straw on the surface of the ice, to give travellers a sure foothold. The Gauls, he tells us further, made from barley a drink called 'zythus'; they also flavoured water with honey, and used it as a drink. There was abundance of gold in their country, and they made massive collars of it. In their temples and sacred enclosures were to be found large quantities of gold consecrated to the gods; but though they were very avaricious none of them dared to touch the stores for fear of their deities.


The Gauls were tall, and had white skins. They had yellow hair, which they were in the habit of washing frequently



The artistic genius of the Celts in the La Tène period found its most adequate expression in the decoration of metal work. Their distinctive form of ornament, partly floral, partly geometric, is seen in this bronze disk from Ireland.



The Gauls had already attained to a very high standard of artistry during La Tène I. These bronze harness pieces were discovered in the chariot-burial of Somme Bionne (see page 1510).



Both bronze and iron were worked by the Celts with supreme skill. Although the bronze bucket (left) that was found in the pit grave at Aylesford, shown in page 1521, seems to have been modelled upon a Greek type, the design on the ornamental band (made clear below) is executed in the distinctively Celtic style. Even more highly finished are the objects of wrought iron (right)—a frame which probably supported an altar or sacrificial slab (upper) and fire-dogs of a very graceful pattern.

#### DIVERSITY AND EMINENT BEAUTY OF CELTIC METAL WORK


*British Museum*

in a decoction of lime, in order to make it lustrous. They brushed their hair up to the top of the head, and thence to the nape of the neck. Some shaved the beard, while others allowed it to grow to a moderate length. The nobles shaved the cheeks, but allowed the moustache to grow until it covered the mouth.

During meals they did not sit upon benches, but on hides of dogs or of wolves spread upon the ground; and the youngest children, boys and girls, acted as attendants. At the side were blazing fires upon which were cauldrons, and spits upon which were entire quarters of meat. The best part of the joint was offered to the chief men as an honour. Passing strangers were invited to partake in the banquets, and it was a point of etiquette not to ask their names or their business until the feast was over.

The food consisted of large quantities of meat and gravy, accompanied by a few loaves. The table manners of the Gauls

were hardly up to modern standards, for it seems to have been the fashion for the diners to take the whole joint with both hands, and to gnaw off mouthfuls, 'after the manner of lions.' The party sat in a circle, he who was most distinguished by military prowess, lineage or wealth in the middle, and the other guests arranged on each side, in regular order of precedence. Behind each guest stood his armour bearer, with his large oblong shield. The attendant spearmen sat in a circle by themselves. In wealthy companies the drink was Massilian wine; the poorer folk drank 'corra,' a sort of beer brewed from wheat and sweetened with honey. They drank from a common cup, carried round by an attendant boy, who began at the right-hand end and worked round to the left. Frequently words would lead to quarrels, and these to duels à outrance, for the Gauls held life to be of no account.



**RICH DECORATION ON BRITISH SHIELD**

The oblong shields of the Celts, of bronze or wood reinforced with metal, were often artistically ornamented, like this example from Lincolnshire. The patterns of its bosses (left), and the stylised boar—once riveted on, now lost, but recognizable from the discoloured metal—are designs of extraordinary skill.

*British Museum*

Before a battle one would go in front of the lines, and would challenge the bravest of the enemy to a duel; and should any of the combatants accept the challenge, his side would sing the prowess of their ancestors and vaunt their own deeds, heaping the while abuse and reviling upon the enemy. Slaughtered enemies were beheaded, and the heads were hung on the necks of the horses; when carried home they were embalmed, and either preserved in caskets or nailed on the houses. This custom at first repelled Poseidonius, though in time he became accustomed to it—just as Londoners became indifferent to similar sights which might have been seen on Temple Bar down to the eighteenth century.

When travelling, and in war, the Gauls rode in two-horse chariots; if used for fighting, each of them accommodated a fighting man and a charioteer.



They wore tunics dyed in many colours, with variegated flowers embroidered upon them, and a leg-wear called 'bracae,' breeches. They had striped cloaks fastened at the shoulder with brooches. Their defensive armour consisted of a shield of the height of a man, often ornamented with bronze figures of animals very artistically worked, and a bronze helmet with large projections, giving the wearer the appearance of one of huge stature. They used clumsy war trumpets of strange shape, which emitted a hollow sound calculated to inspire terror.


Their faces were grim, and their voices deep and gruff. In conversation they affected short epigrammatic sentences, and were given to dramatic gestures. They

exaggerated in lauding themselves, or in belittling others; but they were acute-minded, and were not inept in receiving instruction. The northern tribes, however, and those bordering on the Scythians, were even said to practise cannibalism.

The Gauls had bards, who sang panegyrics and satires, accompanying themselves upon instruments resembling lyres. They also had Gaulish Bards druids, who were highly and Druids honoured philosophers and theologians; and likewise soothsayers, who predicted the future from inspection of the entrails of victims and from the flight of birds. These men of learning had great influence in peace and in war; sometimes they would even throw themselves between two opposing armies and pacify them.

To a certain extent these selections from the reports of eye-witnesses can be confirmed by archaeological or literary evidence. The mode of dressing the hair, the costume, the chariots are represented to the life on the remarkable series of bronze buckets and other figured objects that have been found in central Europe and northern Italy, and that are among the most valuable relics that the Hallstatt period has bequeathed to us (see pages 942-3). The orderly arrangement of the banqueting hall at Tara, as it is reported to us by Irish manuscript authorities, illustrates the description of the Gaulish feasts.


The ancient Irish romance called *The Feast of Bricriu* turns on the custom of giving the chief portion of meat to the chief man present; and the subsequent fight illustrates the stormy scenes of which Poseidonius makes mention. The tale of the Cattle Raid of Cúalnge gives us illustrations of the chariots with their fighting man and their charioteer. The preservation of the head of a conquered foe



#### ENDURING WORK OF CELTIC ARMOURERS

Bronze helmets were worn by the Gauls from early times. The tall, conical specimens seen above (upper) are of the fifth century B.C., and were probably copied from Greek models. Of the casques with projecting neck guards, one (lower left) is of the second century B.C., the other a later British pattern.

British Museum



ALIEN MANNERS FINELY REPRESENTED BY MEANS OF CELTIC ART

In North Italy the original metallurgical art of the later Hallstatt civilization underwent notable refinement, probably as a result of contact with Etruscan ideals. These two strips of reliefs, developed from the bronze pail in page 1166, found near Bologna, represent scenes of everyday Etruscan life—a procession of priests and priestesses with sacrifices (top) and revellers making music (below)—but are plainly the work of a non-Etruscan craftsman under Late Hallstatt influence.

*After Montblaus, 'Civilisation primitive en Italie'*

reappears in Irish literature in the tale of the Swine of Mac Dá Thó. The joint of meat passed from hand to hand is heard of again in the Life of S. Senán, as it is contained in the manuscript known as The Book of Lismore. A certain bishop was voyaging with a company of pilgrims. Their ship was struck by a sudden storm. The bishop *happened at the moment to have the joint in his hand*, and going with it on deck he blessed the air, and sought the protection of S. Senán, thus obtaining a favourable wind.

The cup passed round the guests is akin to the cup of slumber which Gráinne, daughter of king Cormac mac Airt, passed round her guests before her elopement with Diarmait. The practice of incitation, by praise or by revilement, meets us not infrequently in the surviving fragments of ancient Irish literature, as well as in the medieval and early modern folk tales which often preserve archaic reminiscences. Many of the ancient war trumpets are extant, and reveal no little skill in metal-working (see page 944).


It has been supposed by some writers that it was Celtic tribes who introduced the bronze culture into England. Certainly the introduction into that country of the bronze culture coincides with the appearance of an intrusive broad-headed race, which we may presume to have been its introducers. But although the Celtic languages and culture probably originated among a tribe of this Alpine stock, it does not by any means follow that all the people of Alpine stock were Celtic-speaking, nor that all the Celtic-speaking people were of the Alpine stock. It is indeed more than probable that at the beginning of the Bronze Age in northern Europe—say 2500-2000 B.C.—the community with specifically 'Celtic' characteristics was comparatively small; whereas the testimony of ancient graves and their osteological contents shows that the Alpine stock was then spread over a wider territory than it occupied in later times. It has had to yield, step by step, to the aggressive 'peaceful penetration' of the Nordic peoples, slowly absorbing for themselves

all the good lands in plains and valleys, and pressing the round-heads up into the mountains. The diffusion of 'Celticity' throughout Europe coincides with the spread of iron rather than with that of bronze.

In the countries bordering on the eastern Mediterranean iron began to be used, roughly, about 1000 B.C.—perhaps a little earlier. In the heart of Europe it began somewhere about 800 B.C. (see Chap. 30). In the north-west of Europe it does not certainly appear till about 400-350 B.C. Strictly speaking, the Iron Age is still in progress, and is likely to last down to the final depopulation of the world, as it is improbable that any material will henceforth be found to supersede iron for most of the purposes

for which it is used. But in dealing with European archaeology it is convenient to restrict the Iron Age to the time of the greatest extension of the Roman empire—say about A.D. 100—as this fact of history introduced completely new conditions, and there are more convenient bases of classification for the later periods.

This epoch of nine or ten centuries is divided into two periods, each called after some place which has yielded typical remains. The first of these is named after Hallstatt, a village about thirty miles from Salzburg, the site of a great cemetery of the earlier stages of the Iron Age. The second is named after La Tène, the site of an ancient military station on the shore of Lake Neuchâtel in Switzerland, belonging to the second Iron Age phase.




#### CHANGING STYLES OF SWORDS MARK VARIATIONS IN CELTIC CULTURE

Each of the forms and periods of Celtic culture had its characteristic varieties of swords. The earliest specimen here shown is of the Hallstatt era—a massive weapon of iron, with an ivory and amber pommel. Light and short during the first La Tène stage, swords became progressively heavier and longer during the two succeeding periods, being further distinguished by their ornamental scabbards. The so-called 'anthropoid' swords were developed from a Hallstatt prototype.

*British Museum and Dublin, 'La collection Mûller'*

The characteristics of Hallstatt culture are described in Chapter 30. For our purpose the important fact is the geographical distribution of their remains. The Hallstatt civilization is practically confined to eastern and southern Europe. While it was there dominant, western and northern Europe were still in the later phases of their Bronze Age.

The form of culture especially associated with the Celtic peoples in northern and central Europe is, therefore, the later phase of the Iron Age, named after La Tène. This settlement was discovered at the outlet of Lake Neuchâtel, in the course of engineering works undertaken to lower the level of the water of the lake so as to reclaim land around its shore. Close to the place where the river Thièle flows out of the lake there was a shallow place before the drainage operations, which became uncovered by the lowering of the waters. This shallow proved to be a bank of peat overlaid with gravel. The gravel con-




SIMPLE JEWELRY OF THE GAULS

The wearing of personal ornaments would appear to have been universal among the Gauls. Here is a rare bronze collar with two bracelets of glass in the centre; above it, a bronze bracelet (left) and one of coloured beads. The other two objects are earrings of gold, shell-like in their fineness.

British Museum

tained fragments of Roman pottery and tiles, as well as Roman coins; the peat contained the remains of a village of pre-Roman date.



CULTURAL PROGRESS EXEMPLIFIED BY THE PATTERNS OF BROOCHES

The three periods of La Tène culture each had a distinctive form of fibula, or brooch. In that of La Tène I the foot curved upwards and backwards to meet the bow, to which, however, it was not fastened; whereas in La Tène II, while also curving backwards, it was secured to the bow by a collar. In the fibulae of La Tène III the foot was bent inwards to meet the underside of the bow with which it coalesced (see centre specimen), and latterly became a solid, decorated plate.

British Museum

On investigation, the 'village' proved to have been a military station, established to guard a bridge over the Thièle, on the road from Constance to Geneva. This was suggested by the large quantity of weapons and muniments of war found on the site, as contrasted with the small quantity of personal ornaments. The settlement had come to a violent end: skulls with sword-gashes were found, and all manner of goods were cast pell-mell into the old bed of the river, which had flowed through the settlement—the modern bed is well outside its area.



#### USED IN GAULISH FUNERARY RITES

Domestic vessels were customarily interred with the dead. The Somme Bionne grave (opposite) contained a bronze flagon with a handle attachment of Celtic design (here enlarged), and a Greek fifth century kylix giving the date of the tomb.

*British Museum*

The remains were clearly not Roman, and as clearly not of the earlier Hallstatt culture; they fall between the two, and must be assigned to somewhere between 500 B.C. and A.D. 100. Their especial

characteristics have been found exemplified over the greater part of Europe.

The La Tène culture is divided into three periods, each of about two hundred years duration: La Tène I from 500 to 300 B.C., La Tène II from 300 to 100 B.C., La Tène III from 100 B.C. to A.D. 100. Some authorities would continue this nomenclature still further, calling the period of the Roman domination of the Celtic and some of the Teutonic countries La Tène IV, and dividing the subsequent centuries into four more periods, La Tène V (A.D. 200-400), VI (400-600), VII (600-800), and VIII (800-1050). But though undoubtedly there is a basis of La Tène influence in the culture of these later centuries, it is more convenient to separate them from the pre-Roman period in view of the profound changes made, first, by the spread of the Roman empire, and subsequently by Christianity.

The three periods of La Tène culture are distinguished by certain points of difference in some of their productions. The swords of La Tène I, which did not extend to Great Britain, Ireland, northern Germany or Scandinavia, had straight-edged blades of moderate size, and were kept in scabbards with open-work decoration on the chapes or ferules. Helmets of beaten bronze, torques, bracelets and elaborate belt-clasps are found in deposits of this period. Ornaments of Graeco-Italian workmanship were imported to the provinces where this culture was indigenous—testimony to the existence of trade.

The fibulae (brooches) resemble the ordinary safety-pins of commerce in that they consist of a bar or wire of metal, which, beginning at the point, has the following details in its course—point, pin, spring, bow and catch or foot. In the La Tène fibula the metal wire is prolonged beyond the catch, and curved upwards and backwards so as to touch the bow about the middle of its outer surface. In those of La Tène I there is simple contact at this point, the end of the metal not being secured in any way.

The normal method of disposing of the dead in this period was by burial, though cremation was also practised to some

extent. In the north of France warriors were sometimes buried in their chariots. The immigrant tribe of the Parisii, who colonised part of what is now Yorkshire, carried this custom with them.

Remains of the second period of La Tène culture have been found over all northern and western Europe. The swords of this period are longer than those of La Tène I, and with slightly rounded tip; there is a guard at the junction of the blade and the hilt, to prevent the owner's hand from slipping, which is not found in the swords of the previous period. This guard, in the second period, is gracefully curved, resembling the outline of a bell. The open-work scabbard ferules disappear, and metal chains take the place of straps for securing the sword to the waist. Shields are made of wood, but garnished with metal ornaments and mountings; there is an 'umbo,' in the shape of a half cylinder, at the centre.

Coins begin to appear—barbarous copies of classical originals. Glass bracelets are also found, and spiral finger and arm rings of metal are common. Importations from classical centres are, if anything, more frequent. Fibulae resemble in shape those of the previous period, but the end of the metal is no longer left free; it is secured by a small rivet or otherwise. Burial was a much more usual funerary practice than cremation, though the latter was not unknown. Chariot-burials, however, have been abandoned.

In La Tène III we find a tendency to degeneration in the manifestations of culture. The swords are as in the preceding period, but the graceful curved guard is gone; in its place there is a straight bar. Scabbards are made as a rule of metal, and are strengthened by



MILITARY GEAR BURIED WITH WARRIOR

During the period of La Tène a dead man's war-chariot and weapons were sometimes entombed with him, as in this grave at Somme Bionne. The position of the skeleton between the wheels, with the bridle trappings of two horses beyond its feet, shows that it originally rested on the chariot's axle and pole.

*British Museum, Morel Collection*

ladder-like ribs of metal crossing the side at intervals. The umbo of the typical shield of La Tène III is hemispherical in shape, not the half-cylinder of La Tène II. Keys now first appear; and writing is found scratched on potsheerds. Bracelets with the open ends worked into spirals, and globular pendants, are common. In the fibula, the free end is no longer bent upwards, but downwards, so that it passes underneath the bow and touches it on the inner side. Cremation is the commoner method of disposing of the dead.

Objects throughout the La Tène period, especially those of metal, are decorated with the characteristic ornament of the

time. This is a very beautiful and artistic phase of decorative art, so distinctive in its character that, when the eye has once become accustomed to it, it cannot mistake it for any other school of ornamentation. And yet it is almost impossible to express its characteristics in words. It is not wholly floral, nor yet wholly geometrical; it is a most happy combination of both.

A geometrical basis is generally assumed; but it is of a very free nature, not hide-bound by cramping considerations of

mechanical symmetry, which, indeed, is avoided almost as carefully as in Japanese art. The framework is then overlaid with a rich floral treatment, the leaf of the honeysuckle being the chief inspiration; so that the geometrical basis is often most difficult to trace. Nowhere was this art more successfully cultivated than in Great Britain and Ireland. Famous examples are the shield found in the Thames at Battersea, now in the British Museum (see colour plate facing page 1521); the gold collar found at Brough, near Limavady in the North of Ireland; the monumental stone at Turoe House, near Loughrea, Co. Galway; and the bucket from the cemetery at Aylesford in Kent.

In English books it is the custom to speak of La Tène decoration as 'Late Celtic'—a term for which there is not much justification. If we use this term we shall be obliged to call the art of Celtic Christianity 'Later Celtic,' which would be clumsy. The French archaeologists often use the name 'Marnéen' in reference to the important burials of the First La Tène period that have been found in the department of Marne. The name La Tène itself is not wholly free from objection, for it exalts unduly a site which is neither the oldest nor the richest, but happened to be the first to attract scientific attention; the site actually belongs to La Tène II, and its yield of characteristic ornaments has been comparatively scanty. Still less can it claim to be in any sense a centre from which this phase of civilization took its rise. We must remember that the name is only a label, and that it is convenient to retain it as such because it is used by the majority of scholars. It


has at least the advantage of expressing the essential unity of the civilization of western Europe during the Iron Age.

It might have been expected that the use of iron would have spread more rapidly over Europe than it actually did. Its slow diffusion can be most satisfactorily accounted for on the hypothesis that its processes were a secret: a secret jealously guarded by those in possession of it. The Great Powers of the world to-day discourage gun running among peoples likely to become rebels or enemies; those who knew the arts of iron working in ancient times discouraged their extension among peoples who with the aid of iron would have become capable of making weapons as good as their own.

The advantage of iron was twofold; not only were iron weapons immeasurably superior to weapons of bronze, but those to whom iron was accessible were independent of the uncertainties, vicissitudes and limitations of the tin trade. Tin was an essential ingredient of bronze; but there was only a limited number of sources of supply of this metal open to Europeans. Whenever these should be closed by hostilities or otherwise, it was difficult for those shut out from the tin trade to equip an army adequately.

It is quite clear that the art of the smith was regarded as a mystery. Both in Teutonic and in Celtic folk-lore the smith is a magician; in that strange, semi-magical **Guarded Mystery** rune called The Breast-plate of S. Patrick the speaker prays for the strong protection of the Holy Trinity 'against the spells of women, smiths and druids.' And there is good reason to believe that it was the Celtic community, which somehow became acquainted with the mystery of smith-craft, and by its aid spread their conquests directly or indirectly over the greater part of northern Europe, and thus overlaid so many diverse peoples of northern and central Europe with a veneer of Celtic culture.

The possession of iron gave those who had it a superiority over Bronze Age people similar to the advantage enjoyed by the possessors of the latest types of rifles over wielders of flintlocks and blunder-




# **METAL WORK FROM CELTIC BRITAIN MARVELLOUSLY ENGRAVED AND ENAMELLED**

Enamel was a typically Celtic art, nowhere practised with greater success than in Britain. Red was the colour first employed, in imitation of coral, others being added after the Roman conquest—thus Nos. 5 and 8 are early. Nos. 1 and 6 are engraved scabbards, with a hilt; No. 3 a gold and silver pin set with amber; No. 7 a mirror-back; the enamelled objects are probably horse trappings.

*British Museum*





Much of the enamel on the bronze objects in this and the preceding page had cracked away, and is here restored. 1. The bronze shield found in the Thames at Battersea, dating from the beginning of this era. 2. Bronze bridle-bit. 3. Object in form of an amulet, but too heavy for personal wear. 4. Harness ornament.

*British Museum*

#### EVIDENCE FOR THE CRAFTSMANSHIP AND SUPERSTITIONS OF THE ISLAND CELTS

The coral for which red enamel was a substitute was credited with magico-religious properties, and so too was jet. Hence the jet necklace (6) was not merely ornamental, and perhaps the black colouring of No. 8 in the preceding page was intended to imitate jet. Above (5) a necklace of blue beads.

busses. The introduction of iron must therefore inevitably have brought much unrest in its train. Precisely similar disturbances had taken place long before, when iron had made its way into the Aegean area; it resulted in a total collapse of the stability of the Bronze Age peoples of that region, and of their civilization.

Let us take Ireland as a test case. If Ireland had been from the first in touch with the Celtic world, we cannot doubt that she would have shared in the earlier stages of the iron culture. But this is far from being the case. A few—a very few—objects of the Hallstatt period have been found in Ireland; a quite insignificant number in comparison with the wealth of antiquities of all sorts which the country has yielded. Even the first stage of the La



**ARMED IN HIS TOMB**  
In this typical La Tène II grave found at Montfermeil remains of sword, spear, and shield accompanied the skeleton.

*British Museum*

Tène period is unknown. A continuous iron culture does not begin until the second La Tène period, say about 300–350 B.C. Everything earlier than this is just as much an accidental 'wanderer' as the Chinese or Oceanic curiosities that may be seen in a modern drawing-room. The inference surely must be that there was an Iron Age invasion of the country in the beginning of the second La Tène period, and as the inhabitants before this event were Bronze Age aborigines, who there is no reason to suppose were Celtic or even necessarily Indo-European in speech, we infer that here at least the iron culture and the Celtic culture were introduced simultaneously and by the same people.

The Celticisation of Ireland advanced very slowly. In the map of Ireland that can be reconstructed from the data given us by Ptolemy, in the

second century A.D., most of the tribes living on the sea coast still bear non-Celtic names, with the exception of those in the south-east. It was this part of the country, as other evidence also leads us to believe, that was originally invaded by the Celts. There can be little doubt that its objective was the Wicklow goldfields.

One of the most interesting and instructive aspects of the Celticisation of central and northern Europe is to be seen in the domain of religion. It is lamentable that we have no early native texts from the Continental Celts with the exception of a few inscriptions, which are only partially intelligible, and the invaluable Coligny calendar, which gives us a tantalising glimpse into an organization of no little complexity; this document alone is enough to assure us that the Continental Celts were by no means the uncultured barbarians that their enemies and detractors represent. After the Romanisation of Gaul, the old gods were assimilated, superficially, to the deities of the Roman conquerors; and devotees, who wished to



**RICH FURNITURE OF PIT GRAVE**  
The dead were usually cremated in La Tène III, and the ashes buried in vases. To this period belong the pit graves found at Aylesford; that shown here (in section) contains bronze utensils as well as the cinerary earthenware.

*British Museum, 'Iron Age Golds'*



#### CELTIC DESIGN IN SCULPTURE

Sculptors as well as smiths of the La Tène period used the standard floral-geometric ornament of Celtic art, as in this monolith at Turoe House (Co. Galway). The scrolls that cover it seem to have been carved to imitate embossed metal work.

*Cast in British Museum*

express their gratitude to these gods for favours received, erected tablets and altars to them under their old names and their new, side by side. For example, a man was thankful that a friend had come safe from battle, and so erected an altar to a deity whom he called Mars Caturix. Caturix means 'battle - king,' and was undoubtedly the name of an old war god of the district who had become assimilated to the war god of Rome.

If now we analyse the very numerous names of these local divinities, which have been preserved on monuments like this, we find that they fall into two classes. Some, by far the larger number, are purely local divinities. There is, as a rule, only one monument surviving to bear the name of each; if there should be more than one, they are all found together in one place or at most in one district. Often they bear a

name evidently derived from the name of the place where they are found—or perhaps vice versa, in some cases. Thus, the god (Mercurius) Dumiates appears in the ancient sanctuary on the summit of the sacred mountain now called Puy de Dôme, and nowhere else.

Many of the names are Celtic in apparent form and meaning, but others are not capable of interpretation by any Celtic roots known to us. And even the Celticised names may be mere corruptions, as remote from the original sense as some Anglicised forms of Celtic place names. The process that evolved the map name Dogs' Bay in Co. Galway, from the original 'Port na bhfeadog' (pronounced Port na vyadog, and meaning 'Plovers' bay'), is certainly not modern. It may have been in foolish jest that Mark Twain and his friends called their Oriental guides 'Ferguson,' and the Oriental villages which they visited 'Jacksonville' and the like, because 'they could not master their dreadful "foreign" names.' But such lazy corruptions have been perpetrated in earnest by conquerors throughout the centuries.

Besides these petty local and seemingly aboriginal deities, there is a small minority of the names of gods which are to be found universally over the whole extension of the Celtic languages. Grannos, equated to Apollo, Esus, equated, apparently, to Mercurius, are examples of this. The explanation seems clear. The petty gods that form the first group were the



#### ARTISTIC WORK OF GAULISH POTTERS

One of the arts successfully cultivated by the Celts was pottery, and many of their vessels have great beauty and distinction. These vases of burnished ware from Gaul are graceful in form, and are painted with the curved and conventionally floral designs which characterise the art of the La Tène period.

*British Museum*

local gods of mountains, waterfalls, healing springs, etc., which were worshipped by the neolithic aborigines, each in his own region. The Celtic invaders came with their iron weapons; they absorbed the gods of the newly conquered territory, assimilating their names to their own phonetic traditions, while at the same time they imported their own pantheon, consisting originally in the local gods of their own land of origin.

To trace chronologically the progress of Celtic conquest over the Continent north of the Alps is impossible. We have no materials for doing so. It must have been a matter of many centuries, but it never found its chronicler; at least, if it did, the records which he compiled are lost for ever. Livy gives us one brief glimpse. He tells us that in the time of Tarquinius Priscus, king of Rome, there was a good and



CELTIC DEITY WITH ROMAN COMPEERS

Of the religion of the Celts we know little, but the images and Romanised names of many of their deities survive. The Gaulish Cernunnos, god of prosperity, is represented in this bas-relief seated between Apollo and Mercury. He is dressed in Celtic fashion, even having the characteristic metal collar.

Rheims Museum; photo, Girardon



GODS WORSHIPPED BY GAULISH TRIBES

Few Gaulish deities had more than regional influence. Among those widely revered was the god identified with Jupiter; in the image seen above (left) he is holding thunderbolt and wheel, with bronze symbols hanging from his shoulder. The cross-legged attitude of the other deity is typically Gaulish.

Musée des Antiquités Nationales, Saint-Germain-en-Laye

upright king of the people of the Bituriges, by name Ambigatus. During his reign Gaul was so full of crops and of men that it could scarcely be governed. Feeling the advance of old age, Ambigatus abdicated, and divided his kingdom between his sister's sons, Bellovesus and Segovesus. This story Livy tells as a preliminary incident to the first entry of the Gauls into world-history, their invasion of central Italy and sack of Rome in 390 B.C. (see page 1252). He seems to imply that the rule of Ambigatus was not confined to the Bituriges, but that he exercised a kind of empire over all the warring communities of Gaul.

But the story can hardly be authentic history. It is indeed something more valuable than history. It is a saga, or

rather the attenuated abstract of a saga. The old king stripping himself of his kingdom is kin to, if not identical with, the Lear of whose legend Shakespeare makes such impressive use. The names are genuinely Celtic, and must have come from some Celtic source. The inheritance, not by the sons of Ambigatus but by his sister's sons, is a yet earlier feature and seems to indicate that the saga had its roots in an antiquity yet more remote than the Gauls of Livy's time. The same law of succession governed the kingship of the aboriginal Picts of Scotland.

We need not doubt that the tale was actually told in some Celtic tongue, and even that it was written

**Survival of a Celtic Saga** down in a Celtic tongue. Livy was a native of Padua in northern Italy; he might conceivably have had some acquaintance with the Gaulish language and have been able to decipher a narrative written in it. The Gaulish inscriptions, and certain details reported by Caesar and others, show that the Gauls could write: Caesar captured Gaulish dispatches; Poseidonius saw those standing around a funeral pyre writing letters and casting them on the flames, so that the dead might carry them to their friends who had already passed over to the other world. This waif of tradition, preserved in an alien literature, suggests to us that the Continental Celts, like those of the islands, possessed a saga literature, and that among the crimes of the so-called Pax Romana is to be counted the extinction of this ancient picture of a forgotten life.

The Gaulish advance into Italy, which culminated in the sack of Rome in 390 B.C., was probably an incident in the same movement which led to the Celtic colonisation of Ireland. There must have been much unrest among the Celtic and Celticised folk of the time, expressed in a search for fresh fields of conquest. Their territories were too cramped, and they were seeking outlets for expansion.

It is difficult to avoid connecting these events with the economic changes that must necessarily have resulted from the introduction of iron. Iron gave better and stronger weapons to the warrior, more efficient tools to the husbandman; and

thus ambition was stimulated. We may perhaps see a reminiscence of the terror which the flashing iron blades inspired among the bronze-using aboriginal tribes in an element of Irish folklore. The Sword of Light is ever the quest of the hero—the brilliant blade, which never fails of its mark, and the wounding from which is always fatal.

The same century witnessed a picturesque incident in another part of Celtdom. In 335 B.C. Alexander the Great was about to set forth on the Eastern expedition which has gripped the imagination of men ever since. It was necessary to safeguard his kingdom during his absence from troublesome neighbours, and to secure that end he called in the aid of the Celts. The heads of certain Celtic communities came to visit him, and he made terms with them, arranging that they should protect Macedonia from invasion while he was away.

In the course of the banquet he asked them what was it that they feared most. Perhaps he had heard from his master Aristotle of the fearlessness of the Celts; doubtless he expected that diplomacy and politeness would suggest to them the advisability of paying a compliment to their host, and to the alliance which he had condescended to make with them. But instead of the expected answer, all that they said was that they feared lest the sky should fall upon them! Alexander pocketed his chagrin, but when his guests had departed he expressed his vexation to his courtiers by exclaiming: 'What braggarts these Celts are!'

Yet it may well be that he misjudged them. They had sworn allegiance to him; presumably by the oaths by which they had been accustomed to bind themselves in such transactions.


Now we learn from Irish literature that oaths by the celestial phenomena—by sun and moon, day and night, as well as by earth and sky—were in common use; and that it was believed that these, or the gods who presided over them, would take vengeance upon a perjurer. We read of one king who had taken such an oath, and when he broke his word was struck by lightning. Instead of the futile and silly

flattery for which the young king was looking, the Celtic envoys gravely told him that the one thing which they dreaded was the consequence of violating the solemn oath which they had just taken; that he might look to them to do their duty to him without fear of man, and with a very real fear of God. They had actually paid him the most delicate compliment in their power. But it is ever the fate of the Celt to be misunderstood; his intellect is too subtle for the grosser brands of humanity with whom he comes in contact.

Twelve years later Alexander stood in Babylon, a conqueror; and his faithful Celtic allies were among those who sent messengers to congratulate him. Alexander, we may well believe, sent them away with large gifts of money—and most likely the Macedonian coins which the envoys brought back with them supplied the models upon which the majority of the native Gaulish and British coins were based. These certainly are barbaric copies of Macedonian originals.

In the century following the Gaulish sack of Rome there took place a second incident of the same kind: the attack upon Delphi in the year

**Gaulish attack on Delphi** 279. The invasion is picturesquely described in excerpts from earlier historians preserved by Pausanias. No special reason for the invasion is assigned; but it must have been partly desire for plunder, and partly the external manifestation of movements within the Celtic world, of which we have no historical record, and can know only from their reactions upon the civilizations of classical antiquity. The Gauls, we are told, live on the shore of a distant sea, which ebbs and flows—a phenomenon always impressive to writers accustomed to the tideless Mediterranean—and which is not navigable at its farthest part; an observation that probably refers to the thick pack-ice



# DEGENERATING MACEDONIAN INFLUENCE ON COINS

The gold stater of Philip II of Macedon (1) afforded a model for Gaulish and British mints. The design was ingeniously adapted in a coin of the Bellovacii (2); but later a single horse replaced the chariot, and the head was conventionalised (3, 4), eventually becoming a mere pattern (5, 6).

British Museum

which rendered navigation difficult near the Arctic circle. To these people Greece offered tempting baits. Several attempts seem to have been made upon it about the time of which we are speaking.

The first was under the leadership of one Cambaules, who succeeded only in penetrating as far as Thrace. A second and more formidable expedition was then fitted out to attack the country at three points. One army under Cerethrius was to attack Thrace; a second under Brennus and Acichorius went against Paeonia; and a third under Bolgius made for Macedonia and Illyria. This triple expedition was also a comparative failure; but Brennus would not be discouraged. He persisted in stimulating his people with the expectation of booty to be won in Greece. It may be remarked that the leader of the Gauls in their sack of Rome is also called Brennus by our authorities; most probably this is not a coincidence, the word not being a personal name but a title (cognate with the Welsh 'brenin,' king).

Brennus (as we may continue to call him, knowing no other name for him) with his colleague Acichorius made a third attempt. The Greeks had been weakened by their Macedonian wars, and proved unequal to withstand the huge army

which Brennus is said to have commanded—152,000 foot, 20,400 horse, and in addition servants who brought the number of horsemen up to 61,200. Only the Athenians proved capable of meeting them, and they held against them the historic pass of Thermopylae, inflicting on the invaders a severe defeat.

The latter tried to find a pass over Mount Oeta, but at first failed, and Brennus, of whose strategical ability Pausanias or his authority is constrained to speak highly, sent a number of his troops by a roundabout way into Aetolia,

in order to draw off the  
**Horrors of the sack of Callium** people of that province from the defence of the pass. The siege and sack

of Callium by this detachment, maddened by their preceding defeat, is said to have surpassed in ferocity any similar event in history; the least disagreeable among the details related to us is that the Gauls ate all the fattest babies. But it would be well to have such statements confirmed by writers neutral in their interests; the character of a combatant nation is never safe in the hands of its adversaries. Returning from Callium, the Gauls found their retreat cut off by those who had come to the help of Aetolia, and were constrained to force their way through the Greek forces, leaving half of their own number dead on the way.

The main body of the Gauls still remained on the wrong side of Mount Oeta; and the neighbouring town of Heraclea felt considerable alarm lest it should meet with the fate of Callium. To avert the menace, certain citizens treacherously undertook to guide Brennus to a pass over the mountain, by which he would be able to reach his objective, Delphi.

But the Gauls were not destined to succeed in their attempt. When they arrived at Delphi a terrific thunderstorm broke forth, easily explained by the superstitious warriors on both sides as a direct interference of the god on behalf of his most sacred shrine. The excited imaginations of the combatants saw strange giant shapes fighting to protect the temple. The rout of the Gauls was complete. Brennus committed suicide, and his unfortunate followers straggled back

by the way which they had come, running the gauntlet of the numerous enemies who lay between them and home.

Gallic shields hung in the temple of Delphi where Pausanias saw them, and two hymns found inscribed at Delphi in the nineties of the last century, make mention of the repulse of the Gauls.

The story of the Gaulish colonisation of Asia Minor is related by Livy. According to him, the great army of Brennus had become divided by faction even while it was still in Thessaly; and a detachment of twenty thousand men under two leaders named Lonorius and Lutarius, turned eastward, and by a ruse captured Lysimachia, at the base of the peninsula called the Chersonese (Gallipoli). Here they could look across the narrow Propontis (Sea of Marmora) and the Hellespont to the tempting coasts of Asia Minor, which they coveted for themselves. They sent to Antipater of Macedonia for ships to ferry them across; Lutarius awaited them, while Lonorius advanced and occupied Byzantium. Antipater sent some ships, in pretence of complying with the request of the Gauls, but really to keep a watch upon the invaders. Lutarius, however, seized the ships, and with their aid transferred his men across the sea. Thus began the Galatian colony, the only recorded community of Celtic peoples outside the limits of Europe.

Lonorius was shortly afterwards invited across by Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, to assist him in his war against his brother Ziboetes. After winning the war for Nicomedes, the Gauls began a general progress of plunder through Asia Minor; and although, according to Livy, not more than half of the twenty thousand men were armed, they caused a terror through the whole peninsula as far as the Taurus Mountains. Making their headquarters on the river Halys, they ravaged the western parts of the peninsula. They formed three communities—the Trocmi, who operated on the coasts of the Hellespont; the Tolistobogii, who ravaged Aeolia and Ionia; and the Tectosages, who laid the southern regions under contribution. This went on till the reign

of Attalus I of Pergamum (241-197 B.C.), who forced the Gauls to confine themselves to a territory between the Sangarius and the Halys.

Statues of defeated Gauls, along with others, were dedicated by Attalus on the Acropolis of Athens in commemoration of his victory; five of these are still extant. Others were erected at Pergamum itself; among these was probably the bronze original of the famous 'Dying Gaul' (formerly known as the 'Dying Gladiator'). These statues represent the Gauls as coarse featured, with low foreheads and short noses, strong jaws with prominent chins, and thick necks.

But the Gauls were not allowed to enjoy in peace the restricted territory to which they were now limited. The Romans, those implacable enemies of the Celtic world, saw in the warlike—and, be it admitted, predatory—Gaulish colony a menace to their own dominion in the east. Manlius, the consul in 189 B.C., invaded Galatia and defeated them severely. From that time onward they were little more than mercenaries in the service of this Asian kinglet and that, and were usually treated with great treachery.

About the middle of the last century B.C. they passed under Roman protection; but they contrived to maintain their ancestral language until at least the fourth



#### REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GAULISH HORDES THAT RAVAGED ASIA MINOR

To mark his triumph over the Gauls in Asia Minor Attalus I of Pergamum erected statues of his vanquished foes, both at Pergamum and at Athens. Gaulish barbarism is clearly suggested (possibly with hostile exaggeration) in the figures above—the splendid physique and strong, rough features being typical of these northern warriors. The upper group shows a defeated Gaul stabbing himself after killing his wife. Note the typical 'torque' round the neck of the 'Dying Gaul' (lower).

*Above, National Museum, Rome; below, Capitoline Museum, Rome; photos, Anderson*



century A.D., when S. Jerome heard them speaking in a tongue identical with what he had heard among the Treviri of Trèves.

Caesar gives us the fullest details about the Gauls that we possess from the hand of any Roman writer. His Commentary on the Gallic War is a mine of information; but it is naturally limited. His purpose is to describe his own operations, and he writes from the point of view of an enemy of the Gauls. He is, therefore, naturally biased. Still, he gives us many facts of importance, as, for instance, that there was no uniformity of culture among the different Celtic communities. Some of

**What Caesar tells** them, who were situated  
**about the Gauls** on the main highways of commerce and of travel, had attained to no little degree of civilization; while others who dwelt in the backwaters were scarcely raised above the level of savagery. Some were governed by kings, others by annually elected magistrates. The Romans came among the Celts as destroying conquerors, and they justified themselves for their own barbarities by painting their victims in the darkest colours. Yet they were compelled against their will to express admiration for certain aspects of Gaulish life and manners. The great leader Vercingetorix stands out in the pages of his enemies glorious among the greatest heroes of the world.

The school histories of our time, endeavouring to make the subject attractive to impatient youth, seize on the picturesque details of horrors, and neglect those of greater intrinsic importance. They tell us of wild folk with nothing between them and nakedness but a coat of blue paint; but they say nothing of the civilized Cantii, or of the active trade carried on between Ireland and the Continent in wine and other commodities. They tell us of druids burning people alive in wicker crates; but they are silent respecting the solemn druidic assemblies, or of their schools with a severe discipline of study lasting sometimes for twenty years. A history of mediæval Italy which concentrated upon the more lurid proceedings of the Borgias, and said little or nothing about Dante, Savonarola or

Galileo, would be a very one-sided work, and would give no true idea of its subject.

The holocausts of human beings undoubtedly took place. But everything tends to show that they were exceptional and were offered under the stress of exceptional circumstances; that, moreover, in the majority of cases the victims were criminals under sentence of death in any case. That druidic superstitions and barbarities became more and more emphasised in the later Roman writers (as MacCulloch points out, in his work on the Religion of the Pagan Celts) is only to be expected; for the more the Celtic people had to do with the Romans, the more frequent became the occasions that seemed to call for such sacrifices. No doubt it would be equally uncritical to fall into the opposite error. Life among the Celts was not that of the Golden Age, any more than life in the modern world is. But those who have lived through the iniquities perpetrated in Christian and civilized Europe from 1914 onward have no right to throw the stone of scorn at any ancient people whose lot was cast in simpler days, when the refinement of killing people wholesale by machinery had not become a daily commonplace.

Let us glance for a moment at the other side of the picture. Valerius Maximus, a writer of the first century A.D., records for us that the **Vivid belief** Gauls had so vivid a belief in **Future Life** in the future life that they would even lend to one another money to be repaid in the next world. And he comments thus: 'I would call these breeches-wearers fools—only they have perceived what the toga-clad Pythagoras perceived.' He is quite unsympathetic, but he is compelled to admit that the barbarians had evolved the same ideas as a philosopher of whom he was constrained to speak with respect; so he has the grace to withhold his criticisms.

Caesar tells us of the solemn assemblies of the druids in a holy place in the territory of the Carnutes—in all probability the spot on which the great cathedral of Chartres now stands—where, under the reverend presidency of the archdruid, sacrifices were performed, judicial cases tried and laws promulgated. Diogenes

Laertius tells us that the druids taught the youths under their instruction 'to worship the gods, to exercise valour, and to do no evil'—wholly admirable precepts. But we learn from Caesar, once more, that the teaching of the druids was imparted by word of mouth only; nothing was allowed to be written down. He conjectures (wrongly) that this was lest it should fall into profane hands, or for fear of weakening the students' memories by leading them to trust to notes. The real reason, no doubt, was that the teaching was in the form of sacred hymns which would, it was believed, be profaned if committed to writing.

Evidently the teaching was permitted only to those who had passed through some ritual of initiation; and the Roman abolition of the druidic order, and the subsequent victory of Christianity, broke the chain of tradition; so that the druidic teaching, whatever it may have been, is lost for ever. Probably it consisted for the greater part of Veda-like sacred hymns, in which under the form of expressions of devotion to the gods the body of natural philosophy as it was understood was expressed; and of explanatory comments upon the no doubt archaic language of the traditional matter taught.

The remarkable calendar of which a number of fragments were found at Coligny, in the French department of Ain, toward the end of the last century, is a proof of the elaboration of the religion of the

Celtic peoples so far as the recurrence of festivals, times and seasons, and lucky and unlucky days are concerned. Briefly, the fragments belong to a rectangular plate of bronze, closely engraved with a calendar for five years, divided each into twelve lunar months, with two intercalary months devised to establish a correspondence between the solar and the lunar year. Each month had twenty-nine or thirty days; the long and short months alternated with almost uniform regularity; and with one exception all the long months are marked 'lucky' and the short months 'unlucky.'

Each month is divided into two parts, the first always containing fifteen days,

the latter fifteen or fourteen, as the case may be. The latter half is described by the word *Atenoux*, which seems to mean 'the after-night.' There is reason to believe that the first half of the month was the light half, and extended, not as we might expect from new moon to full moon, but from first quarter to last quarter; the *Atenoux* being the dark half of the month, extending from last quarter, through new moon to first quarter.


There is a singularly complicated system of interchange of days between months, which seems to have been designed in order that a lucky day might be borrowed from a lucky

Interchange of  
lucky days

month, to be inserted into an unlucky month, for the purpose of securing an auspicious performance of whatever was the appropriate rite of the day. The calendar is, in short, a testimony to an extraordinary subtlety and ingenuity, to no small mathematical and astronomical skill, and to a very high elaboration of religious ritual among the Celtic peoples of the first century B.C.—the probable date of the document.

It is the tragedy of the Celtic peoples that they have never had a chance to build up an enlightened civilization of their own. Rome and the Teutons between them have crushed them to the dust whenever they seemed to be gaining a footing on which to develop the contributions which they might have made to the culture of the world. Over all the long record of baffled effort sprawl the words, written by those two arch-enemies of Celtdom, each in his own manner, 'We will not have this man to reign over us.'

No people of ancient or modern time possessed the art of denationalising their subjects more completely than the Romans. After they had been established in Gaul for a century or two, the pride of race had completely evaporated, and a contented servility took its place. The fragment extant of the verses 'De reditu suo' (His Return), by the fifth century Gaulish poetaster Rutilius, is almost painful reading—so fulsome are his slavish compliments to Rome, so contemptuous is he of his native country.



**STAPLE ARTICLES OF COMMERCE ON WHICH THE GREAT TRADING CITIES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN FLOURISHED**

A widespread Mediterranean trade was no new thing in the Hellenic age; Egypt, Crete, Phoenicia, had exported their wares far afield, as excavation testifies. But the Greek war on Tyrrhenian and Carthaginian freebooters, and especially the organized suppression of piracy by such maritime states as Athens, gave it an immense impetus. This map, besides the principal trading cities, indicates the staple commodities in the various regions; in the inset are shown the areas of the Achaean and Olynthian leagues which, from their adoption of a common currency, we may judge to have been partly commercial in character.

# ANCIENT COMMERCE AND THE MEDITERRANEAN

How the Pioneers of Trade made a Commercial Unit of the Middle Sea from Tartessus to the Euxine

By G. H. STEVENSON

Fellow and Prælector in Ancient History, University College, Oxford, and University Lecturer in Ancient History

THE Greeks were interested in geography, as in all other sciences. Their earliest philosophers indulged in cosmological speculations, and Herodotus adopts so polemical a tone when he discusses geography as to make it clear that problems concerning the shape of the earth and the distribution of the continents had excited considerable controversy before the middle of the fifth century B.C. Enough is known about the views of his predecessors, however, to justify us in considering Herodotus as the father of scientific geography, as well as of history and of anthropology.

No Greek of the fifth century had a wider horizon than he. A native of one of the smaller Greek states, he had travelled widely, perhaps for purposes of trade, and felt at home wherever the Greek language was spoken or understood—in Egypt, in the Crimea and in South Italy. Fortunately he was a practical man and not a philosopher. He knew that geographical facts are discovered by observation and exploration; he realized that there was still much to learn, and that it was presumptuous to draw a symmetrical picture of a world still unexplored; and, though he was undoubtedly credulous, he was an honest man who never consciously attempted to deceive his readers. It is therefore well worth while to consider how much he knew about the world, for it is unlikely that many of his contemporaries were better informed.

The world of Herodotus is essentially a Mediterranean world. He did not, indeed, know of the great mountain chains which cut off central and northern Europe from southern lands (to him 'Alpis' and

'Carpis' are tributaries of the Danube, and 'Pyrene' a city), but he viewed all that lies north of the Mediterranean seaboard as very nearly a terra incognita—an unknown land penetrated occasionally by enterprising traders from the Black Sea or the northern Adriatic or Marseilles, and producing such valuable commodities as gold, tin and amber.

Europe is to him the greatest of the three continents; its western limit is 'the land of the Celts and the city of Pyrene,' while its eastern and northern boundaries are known to none. Of the shape of Asia and Africa he has fairly definite ideas, but it is only of the southern fringe of Europe that he professes to have exact knowledge. Strange tales of the peoples of northern Europe had reached him, tales of one-eyed Arimaspians and of gold-guarding griffins; he had heard of 'Tin Islands' in the Northern Ocean, and of a great river, the Eridanus, from which amber reached the Mediterranean. But these stories were regarded by Herodotus with an almost scientific scepticism: travellers' tales and the inventions of poets he refused to regard as evidence.

His predecessors had believed that the world was surrounded by an Ocean, and Herodotus admits that the voyages of explorers had established the existence of sea to the south of Asia and Africa, from the Indus to the Strait of Gibraltar. But he could produce no similar evidence for sea to the north of Europe: in spite of all his efforts he could not find an eye-witness, and thus the Eridanus and the Tin Islands do not appear on his map of the world. As it happens, his conclusion



established by the voyage of Phoenicians in the days of Necho, king of Egypt. They sailed round the continent from east to west, 'having the sun on their right hand,' and after three years entered the Mediterranean by the Pillars of Hercules.

For Herodotus, as for us, Asia begins at the Bosphorus and stretches from there to the east. But its eastern limit was the valley of the Indus, and to the north all that lay beyond the Caucasus was included by him in Europe, which in length 'stretched along' both the others (see map in opposite page). To the Greeks of the fifth century the coastline of Asia Minor was of course familiar; and the settlers on the west coast had penetrated fairly far up-country along the valleys of the rivers at whose mouths their cities lay.

Since the rise of the Persian Empire the whole of the Near East had been ruled from Susa, a city to which many a Greek had, voluntarily or involuntarily, found his way. A good road, described by Herodotus in detail, connected western Asia Minor with Mesopotamia, and when Aristagoras of Miletus, at the beginning of the fifth century, arrived in Greece to invite Athens and Sparta to join in a great campaign against the power of Persia he brought with him a map depicting the country through which this road ran. It made the distance from Sardis to Susa appear surprisingly small to those who did not, like the king of Sparta, ask awkward questions about the scale.

Herodotus' knowledge of Mesopotamia is inadequate, but he was well aware of the lines of communication which

Limited knowledge  
concerning the East

connected it with Europe through the passes of the Taurus, and with Egypt through Syria and Palestine. He knew of the desert which, until the very modern developments of air and motor transport, has prevented direct communication between Mesopotamia and Egypt, and which cuts off the eastern coastline of the Mediterranean from the interior at least as effectively as a great river like the Danube or a great mountain range like the Caucasus.

Of India and Arabia, and the most distant parts of Asia, Herodotus' knowledge is as vague as is his knowledge of the


interior of Europe; it is quite clear that Greek traders had not yet penetrated either to the Indus or the Baltic. But somehow the produce of these regions had reached the known world. 'The ends of the earth,' says Herodotus, 'produce the most precious things'; as amber and tin come from the north, gold and perfumes come from the east. Such knowledge as Herodotus possessed must have been derived by him from Persian sources, for the Great King exercised a rather vague authority as far as India, and some of the produce of the East reached Susa in the form of tribute.

It was a very homogeneous world, with which Herodotus was familiar, a world which faced a single sea and turned its back on its continental neighbours, from whom in most parts

it is separated by definite Homogeneity of natural barriers. The the Ancient World

north coast of Africa, as has so often been said, belongs geographically to Europe. Behind the coastline of Spain lies a high and rugged plateau, which it took the Romans centuries to subdue; and the whole peninsula is isolated by the mountain wall of the Pyrenees. Italy is cut off from central Europe by the barrier of the Alps. From Trieste to Constantinople the more or less civilized coastline has throughout history possessed a hinterland into which culture has not easily penetrated. The history of Asia Minor has always been determined by the contrast in geographical character between the coastline and the plateau of the interior; in antiquity we find 'a Greek fringe woven round an Oriental garment.' Finally, as has been noted, the coast of Syria and Palestine is merely a narrow strip lying between the sea and the sandhills of the desert.

The course of ancient history was determined by these familiar geographical facts. All the states which touched the Mediterranean coastline were driven to take to the sea, if they aimed at political or commercial influence. Modern discoveries have strikingly confirmed Greek traditions of the sea power of Crete in the second millennium B.C., and have proved that at that early date commodities and perhaps settlers moved freely from one part of the Mediterranean over



### THE PHAROS OF ALEXANDRIA, SEVENTH WONDER OF THE WORLD

Evidence from coins, descriptions by early travellers and researches by archaeologists all tend to justify this tentative reconstruction of the Pharos of Alexandria. It was built by Sostratus of Cnidus between 290 and 280 B.C., and consisted of three superimposed towers, the lowest square, the middle one octagonal and the topmost circular. Its height has been estimated at from 350 to 600 feet, and the beacon light, reinforced by a powerful reflector, was visible 25 miles out to sea.

*After a reconstruction by F. Thiébaud*

to another. Later, the bold-  
est seafarers came from the  
Greek cities and the Phoeni-  
cian communities of Tyre and  
Carthage. And it must be  
remembered that even pre-  
dominantly land kingdoms  
like Persia and Egypt were  
obliged at times, perhaps un-  
willingly, to develop their sea  
power, and that as soon as  
the aspirations of Rome ex-  
tended beyond Italy she was  
forced to create a navy.

It has been said that the  
Mediterranean world is homo-  
geneous. A native of Greece, for example,  
who was forced to go abroad found in  
Asia Minor, in Sicily, in parts of North  
Africa, geographical and climatic con-  
ditions in which he could feel at home;  
and even if, as in South Russia, the climate  
and vegetation were rather strange to him,  
he did not experience such a contrast as  
is familiar to western Europeans whose  
duties take them to tropical countries. It  
was politics far more than geography that  
restricted freedom of intercourse. Until  
the whole Mediterranean basin passed  
under the rule of Rome at the beginning of  
the Christian era parts of the coastline  
were usually dominated by states which



TYRIAN SHIP OF THE NINTH CENTURY B.C.

Herodotus has a story of wreckage being identified as coming  
from a Phoenician ship by the horse's head carved on  
the broken prow. That such a feature was characteristic of  
Phoenician vessels is shown by this picture on Shalmaneser's  
bronze gates at Balawat (see page 879), of a ship from Tyre.

*British Museum*

resented the presence of foreigners as  
settlers and even sometimes as traders.

But the great days of Rome lie outside  
the period with which we are specially  
concerned. When this period begins the  
eastern Mediterranean was dominated by  
the Persian Empire, into whose hands fell  
both the Phoenician cities, with their still  
powerful fleets, and the ancient kingdom  
of Egypt. In time of peace the Persians  
do not seem to have imposed restrictions  
on trade with other parts of the Mediter-  
ranean; but Greeks did not feel happy  
under Persian rule, which it was conven-  
tional for Greek writers to describe as  
'slavery,' and certainly during the first



EARLY COMMERCE: MERCHANTMEN IN A BUSY EGYPTIAN PORT

From a grave of Thothmes III at Thebes comes this animated picture of an Egyptian port with mer-  
chantmen prepared to discharge cargo. Details show a brisk trade in provisions, clothing and other  
necessaries for the crew coming ashore, and port authorities in attendance to grant permits to  
land, collect port dues and so forth. The physique and dress of the crew show that they were  
Phoenicians, but the ships in general structure resemble Egyptian vessels of about 1500 B.C.

*From Kérou Archéologique*




two centuries of our period there is no trace of any large settlements of Greeks in Persian territory comparable to the movement of population which followed Alexander's conquest. Then, of course, the East came under rulers of Greek stock, and many Greeks were attracted by the opportunities thereby provided.

If the expansion of the Greeks in the East was hampered by the Persian Empire, in the West a more active obstacle was presented by the powerful commercial states of Carthage and Etruria, which, as we shall see, regarded the Greeks as dangerous rivals. It is rather surprising that the city of Massalia (the modern Marseilles), which until the days of the Roman Empire retained its Greek character, was allowed to survive and to spread Greek influence along the Riviera and up the valley of the Rhône. Thucydides, indeed, mentions among the early battles of Greek history the victory gained by the founders of Massalia over the Carthaginians, but after this it seems to have been left in comparative peace.

It was thus only in the central part of the Mediterranean that Greek influences predominated. Though the Greeks had a considerable power of assimilating non-Greek peoples, as was shown in North Africa and round the Black Sea, they could not combine with Phoenicians; in Cyprus, as in Sicily, their Mediterranean neighbours were always regarded as foreigners, with whom at best a tolerable 'modus vivendi' could be arranged.

It lies outside the scope of this chapter to discuss in detail the causes which led to the spread of Greek settlements over so large a part of the Mediterranean coast (see Chapter 34). The process was practically complete by 550, and during the two centuries which followed there was little extension of the area subject to Greek influences. Though the best authorities agree that in the first instance Greek colonisation had generally been due to land hunger on the part of overcrowded and misgoverned inhabitants of agricultural states, the final result of this shifting of population was a vast



IMAGINATIVE VIEW OF THE ISLAND AND LIGHTHOUSE OF PHAROS—

Of the Alexandria founded by Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. few remains exist, but recent surveys have rendered possible this approximately accurate reconstruction of the harbours of what was long the greatest seaport in the world. It was built on the sandy spit of land between lake Mariut on the south and the Mediterranean, with the Island of Pharos in front of it. The harbour was bisected by an embankment 1400 yards long, the Heptastadium, which joined the city to the island.

*Reconstruction drawing by A. Forestier from M. Gaston Jodet—*

extension of commercial activity. The Greeks showed great discrimination in their choice of sites; they were to be found at the end of great trade routes, at the mouths of the rivers of South Russia and of Asia Minor; they occupied the rich lands of Sicily, Campania and southern Italy; and they were attracted by the metals of Cyprus and Spain.

The presence of Greeks in the western Mediterranean as, for example, in Corsica, was unwelcome to the commercial Carthaginians, and the Phocaean settlers were expelled from the island. This desire on the part of Carthage to prevent the extension of the Greek sphere of influence in the west is illustrated by the unfortunate experiences of Dorieus, a Spartan prince, who at the end of the sixth century B.C. indulged in projects of colonisation. He was singularly ill advised in his choice of a site. His first attempt was made in a fertile district of Tripoli, but it was thwarted by native and Carthaginian opposition. On the north coast of Africa the Greeks had long been

established in Cyrene, which the Carthaginians tolerated, as they tolerated Massalia. But Greek settlements farther to the west were not to be endured. An attempt made later by Dorieus, this time with the sanction of the oracle at Delphi, to secure a site in the west of Sicily was equally unsuccessful; until she was expelled by Rome, Carthage insisted on keeping in her own hands the part of the island which lay nearest to her. The pious Herodotus is exercised in mind at the failure of a colonial enterprise authorised by Delphi, and suggests that Dorieus would have been successful had he gone straight to his goal instead of being involved in the war between the Italian cities of Sybaris and Croton.

But if, at this time, it was difficult for Greeks to find sites for new settlements it was very easy for them to move about within their own section of the Mediterranean area. When the attempt made by the Asiatic Greeks to escape from Persian rule had collapsed with disaster, Samians and Milesians sailed to Sicily and established



#### —AND THE HARBOURS OF ALEXANDRIA IN THE DAYS OF ITS GLORY

To the west of the Heptastadium lay the harbour of Eunostos, or Happy Return; to the east was the Great Harbour, entered by a channel between the lighthouse and the Diabatra, or breakwater, built out from the Lochias promontory. The Royal Palace stood on this promontory and here, beside the island of Antirrhodos, was the Royal Harbour. Along the shore stretched the Brucheion where lay the Museum: Theatre, Pancon and Gymnasium (see also plan in page 1439.)

—'Les ports submergés de l'ancienne ville de Phara'

themselves on the Strait of Messina. Later in the fifth century Pericles founded a colony at Thurii, in South Italy, in the hope of spreading Athenian influence in the West. And at all times many individual Greeks went abroad to seek their fortune.

In the most famous period of Greek history the age of colonisation on a large scale was over. The development of trade and industry had largely solved the problem of overpopulation which in the earlier agricultural societies had been the chief incentive to emigration.

But the influence of the Greeks was not destined to be confined permanently within the limits set by Persia and Carthage, as in the sixth century. The success of Alexander the Great shifted the centre of gravity in the Greek world. As the historian Beloch has pointed out, a circle drawn from the Piraeus with a radius of one thousand kilometres (620 miles) would have included practically all the Greek colonies which existed in the middle of the fourth century B.C.—from Sicily and Naples in the west to Cyprus and Naukratis in the east. Only a very few districts in which Greek influence was strong lay outside the circle—in the west



#### ALEXANDRIAN COPPER

Minted in the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98-117) at Alexandria, this copper coin appropriately bears the design of the famous lighthouse on the reverse.

*British Museum*


Massalia, and in the north the Crimea. But after Alexander all this was changed.

In the Hellenistic age Athens and Corinth were completely eclipsed by the new foundations of Alexandria and Antioch. The Greeks of the

mother country even at this period did not achieve political unity, and their country was the scene of wars and revolutions until it came under the domination of Rome. But in the East the third century B.C. was a period of comparative peace and prosperity. By the end of our period Alexandria was the largest city in the world, three times as large as Athens and twice as large as Syracuse at the periods of their greatest prosperity. Antioch, through which the riches of the

East reached the Mediterranean, was second in importance only to Alexandria. Asia Minor and Syria were full of cities whose constitutions were modelled on Greek lines and whose population contained a large Greek element, drawn partly from soldiers who had served under Alexander or his successors, partly from traders who had gone east to seek their fortunes, and partly from bodies of men more or less forcibly transferred from Greece or the old cities of Asia Minor.

Only the most primitive societies are entirely self-supporting. As soon as material civilization reaches a very modest level the inhabitants even of favoured lands feel the need of articles which they themselves cannot produce, and thus trade begins. The



ANTIOCH 'THE BEAUTIFUL,' AS IT IS TO-DAY

Antioch, founded by Seleucus Nicator in 300 B.C., stood on the Orontes, about sixty miles west of Aleppo and fourteen miles from the sea. As a gatehouse through which merchandise from the East reached the Mediterranean, its commercial importance was second only to that of Alexandria.

countries which faced each other round the Mediterranean seemed intended by nature to provide for each other's needs. As we have seen, certain precious materials, amber, gold, tin and spices, reached the Mediterranean from the distant north and east in the time of Herodotus, but in the main the known world formed a self-contained economic unit.

The valley of the Nile, the great plains of South Russia and part of the coast of North Africa were capable of producing far more corn than was

needed by the inhabitants, industrial age who were glad to exchange it for the wine or oil or manufactures of other regions. The forests of Thrace provided an inexhaustible supply of timber. The great mineral wealth of Spain was famous in very early times, and the history of Cyprus was determined by its copper mines. Countries possessing no great natural resources either lagged behind in civilization, like north-western Greece, or else were driven by economic needs to develop industry and thus produce objects which they might exchange for the things that they were forced to import.

Commercial intercourse between the Mediterranean lands began as early as the third millennium B.C., and there is now abundant evidence that, at any rate in the later days of Cretan power, there were few parts of the area which were not visited by merchants. Ships form a very common motif on Cretan seals and on vases from Minoan sites—vessels with high prows and sterns, the former decorated with a fish and the latter with a fishtail; they have a high mast in the middle and are frequently fitted with oars. The Minoans, indeed, seem to have established a very considerable trade with countries overseas.

Discoveries have confirmed the Greek tradition of a connexion between Crete and Sicily. Herodotus tells us that Minos met his death in Sicily in an attempt to rescue Daedalus, a figure who typifies the art and the industry of

Crete, and that his followers settled in the heel of Italy, on a site between Brindisi and Taranto; and pottery of late Minoan date has actually been found on the very spot. Pottery and arms of a similar character have been discovered in many Sicilian graves. There are traces of Minoan objects in Sardinia and also in Spain, whence the makers of bronze received the tin brought from Britain.

The relations between Crete and Egypt were, of course, of the closest; in 1467 Thothmes III commissioned the 'Keftiu' (Cretans) to transport to Egypt wood from Lebanon in their ships of cedar. Evidently Minoan ships were able to carry heavy weights. In the palace of Cnossus have been found blocks of liparite, a rare stone which must have come by sea from the islands (Lipari Islands) which give it its name. Finally, objects belonging to this period have been found in large numbers both in the islands of the Aegean and at various points on the mainland of Greece.

Between the age of Minos and historical times lies a period of which, in spite of the Homeric poems, we have inadequate knowledge. But, if the *Odyssey* can be regarded as more than an imaginative picture of an age long past, we may assume that seafaring was a familiar occupation long before the Trojan war. A voyage



SHIP MOTIFS ON EARLY CRETAN SEALS

Cretan ships, usually one-masted, with straight prow and stern, and sometimes with a cabin (top right), appear on many Minoan seals. The disk above the boat (top left) is a time symbol denoting a long annual voyage. The trees and ships on the long seal (bottom left) denote overseas trade in timber.

From Sir Arthur Evans, 'Scripta Minoa'

to Egypt was a matter of course to an enterprising captain. The precious objects in the palaces of Homeric chiefs were rarely produced at home; they had come from distant lands, whether as gifts or as booty or by means of regular trade. The story of Scylla and Charybdis is generally taken to imply a knowledge of the Strait of Messina. Abyla, 'the land where silver grows,' is probably Spain. The story of the Argonauts shows that the Black Sea was visited by Greeks before Milesians had colonised its coasts.

In the period with which we are more particularly concerned trade flourished in the Mediterranean lands probably even more vigorously than in the days of Minoan Crete. To a trader the greater part of the coastline was always open. Navigation, it is true, was hampered by wars and pirates, but the protective tariffs which in modern times interfere with the free movement of commodities were un-

known to the ancients. Moderate dues were charged at the various ports, and sometimes on ships passing through straits, but their object was simply revenue, and not defence against foreign competition.

Ancient governments of course did not hesitate to pass regulations concerning exports and imports. For instance, Athens, on the advice of Solon, forbade the export of all natural products except olive oil; and later, in the period of her hegemony, made use of her sea power to ensure that she obtained all that she wanted of the Black Sea corn before any was allowed to reach her subjects. At a time when Argos and Aegina were on bad terms with Athens they put an embargo on the import of Attic pottery. It is significant that though Corinthian vases were at one time in great demand no trace of them has been found in the commercial city of Miletus, which regarded Corinth as a rival. The commercial policy of Carthage was



**SPECIMEN NAUKRATITE POTTERY FROM THE TEMPLE OF APHRODITE**

Naukratis stood on a navigable arm of the Nile near the modern Nebira. Here in the sixth century B.C. Amasis concentrated all the Greeks of his kingdom, and from that time until eclipsed by Alexandria in the third century Naukratis was the principal trading emporium in the Mediterranean. Merchandise from all parts of the known world passed through its harbours and warehouses, and the town was also world-famous for the manufacture of scarabs and of painted and inscribed pottery.

*From A. H. Gardiner, 'Naukratis,' Egypt Exploration Society*



#### AN EARLY GREEK SEA-ROVER

If the *Odyssey* can be cited as authority, sea-faring was a familiar occupation in the time of the Trojan War. In ships not dissimilar from this, in which Odysseus is depicted listening to the Sirens' song, the Greek sea-rovers must have sailed.

*British Museum*

usually exclusive. Foreign merchants were excluded from her settlements on the coast of Spain, and by a treaty made with Rome in 348 B.C. Roman traders were forbidden to traffic with Africa or Sardinia.

But these regulations are exceptional. Even Carthage had by an earlier treaty allowed the Romans to trade freely in some of her harbours, and the severe regulations mentioned above were probably due to the beginnings of political hostility. Greek merchants could generally dispose of their goods even in countries where they would not have been allowed to settle. Thus Etruria, which joined with Carthage in turning the Greeks out of Corsica, provided an excellent market for vases and other Greek products.

The relations of Phocaea, the Greek colony on the Gulf of Smyrna, with southern Spain were extremely close. Sostratus, who 'discovered' Tartessus, the district in which Cadiz was afterwards built, and brought back the most valuable cargo which had ever been known, had many successors. The superiority of Greek to Carthaginian industry was so marked that even the strong Carthaginian navy was not able to prevent Greek products from finding their way into the Punic sphere.

At the other end of the Mediterranean we find that Greek trade with Egypt was

well established at the beginning of our period. Egypt was ruled by a dynasty which had risen to power with the help of Greek mercenaries. These mercenaries had been allowed to settle in the seventh century on one of the eastern mouths of the Nile, but in the following century King Aahmes II (Amasis) concentrated all the Greeks in his kingdom at Naukratis on the west of the Delta, a city which Greeks had indeed visited earlier, but whose prosperity began at this date.

This remarkable settlement was not a colony of the ordinary Greek type, but a trading 'emporium' on foreign soil, frequented by many whose home was elsewhere. Its

character has been described by Glotz: Situated on a navigable arm of the Nile, communicating by canal with the capital



#### TRADING IN CORINTHIAN VASES

The pottery which the artist has shown in the background of this vase painting is thought to indicate the cargo of the ship—one of those Mediterranean 'tramps' that popularised the famous Corinthian ware in the 6th century B.C.

*From Duruy, 'Histoire des Grecs'*



#### COINS FROM ONE OF THE REMOTEST OF THE GREEK COLONIES

From the inhospitable shores of Scythia to mysterious Tartessus in the extreme west Greek colonists or Greek influence permeated the Mediterranean world. In fact one of the most flourishing of Greek colonies was the Milesian foundation of Olbia at the northernmost point of the Black Sea, deriving its wealth from the export of corn. These bronze coins are all from Olbia, that in the bottom right-hand corner being slightly less reduced than the rest. The dolphin may be a weight.

From E. H. Minns, *'Scythians and Greeks,' Oxford University Press*

Sais, well administered by Greek prostatai (governors), Naukratis, with its four warehouses dominated by temples, its maze of lanes about the harbour, its manufactures of pottery, falence and terra-cotta, and its quarters reserved for the natives, appears like one of those cities with a motley population, full of life and movement, which trade has at all times caused to spring up on the shores of the Mediterranean.

Though the great days of Naukratis were probably in the sixth century, it maintained its existence throughout the Persian period, and did not come to an end till the third century A.D. It was not only a trading but a manufacturing town, which in its early days produced scarabs and pottery in an almost purely Egyptian style. As has been said, the early settlers, 'instead of being able to tempt the cupidity of the natives by a display of works of archaic Greek art, had to admire vessels and textile fabrics, images and ornaments, designed with a skill which far surpassed their own, and showing a delicacy and pureness of style which aroused their envy.' Later, Naukratis sank into

insignificance beside its great successor, Alexandria, from which the produce not only of Egypt, but of Africa and Arabia, reached the Mediterranean.

Much was done by the Greek kings of Egypt to foster trade with the east. The Red Sea was kept free from pirates, and trading settlements were founded along its shore, from one of which, Berenice, a road ran to Coptos in Upper Egypt. In this way the perfumes and spices of Arabia were brought to Alexandria, where they were prepared for the Mediterranean markets. Ivory from Ethiopia came down the Nile. From the Egyptian papyrus paper was manufactured, and the glass and carpets of Alexandria were everywhere in demand.

Alexandria developed into a great industrial community, favoured not only by its geographical position but by the character of its intelligent and industrious population, from whom employers of labour could draw an indefinitely large number of workmen. Probably in no other city of antiquity was industry organized on a scale so nearly approaching

that of the modern world. In Roman times there were leaders of industry in Alexandria who declared that they could raise an army.

But it was the agricultural wealth of Egypt not less than the manufactures of Alexandria which attracted traders to the country. The less fertile countries of the Mediterranean area cast greedy eyes on the cornfields of the Nile and were eager to exchange their own wine or oil or manufactures for Egyptian grain. It is, however, in the time of the Roman Empire that we hear most of Egyptian corn, and in the period with which we are particularly concerned the regions from which most corn was exported were the Black Sea and Sicily.


Miletus, the enterprising state which dominated Naukratis in its early days, was the pioneer also in the Black Sea, and founded most of the Greek cities which lined its shores. On the north coast these settlements must have presented some resemblance to Naukratis, and have possessed a rather shifting population to whom the climate and surroundings were unfamiliar. As in Egypt, the Greeks were

influenced by the natives, and the researches of archeologists have revealed in South Russia a culture in which Greek and non-Greek elements are curiously blended. The great days of Miletus were nearly over by the sixth century B.C., however, and in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. the state that showed most interest in the Black Sea was Athens.

Long before Athens was strong enough to aim at empire we find her fighting with Mytilene for the possession of Sigeum at the mouth of the Dardanelles, and in the sixth century the Chersonese (Gallipoli) was ruled by members of the Athenian family which produced Miltiades, the victor of Marathon—

The tyrant of the Chersonese  
Was Freedom's best and bravest friend.

It is clear, indeed, that Athenian imperialism can in the long run be attributed to the need of imported food. As we saw, Solon at the beginning of the sixth century forbade the export of Athenian corn, and thereby started Athens on her career as an industrial state which paid for food with manufactures. As it



WEST WING OF THE HARBOUR MARKET OF MILETUS

Occupying a favourable position at the mouth of the valley of the Maeander in Asia Minor, Miletus at a very early date was a busy commercial city. In the seventh century B.C. it founded more than sixty cities along the Hellespont, Propontis and Black Sea coasts; and before 500 B.C. was the greatest Ionian Greek city. Afterwards, Athens superseded it in the Black Sea trade, but it remained a trading centre and these ruins of the Harbour Market are of Hellenistic date.

*From Theodor Wiegand, 'Milet'*




was to the Black Sea that Athens looked for corn, the 'freedom of the Straits' was always to her a matter of life and death. She could not allow Byzantium, the famous Megarian colony, now Constantinople, to fall into the hands of her enemies. It is significant that she was finally brought to her knees at the end of the Peloponnesian War by a victory gained in the Dardanelles. Just as Napoleon thought that the best means of striking at England was to attack Egypt, so the enemies of Athens realized that by blocking the Straits they could starve her out and secure her submission.

There is abundant evidence in the inscriptions and in the writings of the orators that in the fourth century B.C. the political and commercial relations between Athens and the 'kingdom of the Bosphorus' in South Russia were of the closest. The kings favoured Athenian traders above those of other states, granting them exemption from export duty, and in reward were voted crowns of

honour by the Athenian people. These traders exported from the north not merely grain but also hides, salt fish, cattle and slaves, and in return sold oil and wine, vases and other products of Athenian industry.


If Athens looked to the Black Sea for her corn, and made use of her naval power to ration other Greek states, it seems probable that many of these states looked to Magna Graecia to satisfy their need of imported food. During a considerable period of antiquity, Sicily was a great producer of grain, and the Roman Republic made full use of her political power to obtain from Sicily as much corn as she required; indeed, she seems to have controlled the export of Sicilian corn in much the same way as Athens had controlled the Pontic trade. At an earlier period a very considerable amount of this grain had found its way to Greece along with other products of the Greek West, such as timber, pigs and cheese. This trade was for long dominated by Corinth



#### MARITIME ACTIVITY OF THE SIXTH CENTURY ATHENIAN

To the Athenians especially was due the expansion of overseas commerce in the fifth century B.C. The sea was 'in their blood,' and all things maritime made strong appeal to them. Here (top left) is a vigorous vase painting of the preceding century showing two ships racing—warships as proved by the rowlocks and formidable rams. Equal animation distinguishes the clay relief beside it, and the oared galley on the geometric vase below points to their naval activity at an earlier date.

*From August Koster, 'Das Antike Seewesen'*



#### A CAREFUL BUSINESS TRANSACTION

This vase painting, emanating from the workshop of Taleides, dates probably from the early fifth century B.C. If to modern eyes the picture is quaint in its stylistic conventions, it is nevertheless valuable as evidence of the use of scales, weights and measures and of the keen business spirit of the age.

*From Tillyard, 'The Hope Vases'*

and her daughter states, Corcyra and Syracuse, almost as completely as the Black Sea trade was dominated by Athens; indeed, many historians are inclined to find the ultimate cause of the Peloponnesian War in the jealousy with which Corinth regarded the efforts of Athenian traders to extend their activities to the western Mediterranean.

While Athens was content to be the successor of Miletus in the north-east a conflict could be, and was, avoided; but from the time of Themistocles many Athenian public men favoured a western policy, and dreamed not merely of commercial activity in Italy and Sicily but of an empire in the West. The most famous advocate of this policy was Alcibiades, the inspirer of the disastrous expedition against Syracuse. In his later days Pericles had frowned on these ambitions and had considered that Athens had enough to do in maintaining her control of the Aegean, but after his death the ultra-imperialist party got the upper hand. At first they did little more than use Athenian sea power to prevent the importation of corn into the Peloponnese, but later in the war an ambitious scheme of

annexation was adopted, whose failure ultimately brought about the downfall of the Athenian Empire.

There is much truth in the view that the foreign policy of Athens, and of many other ancient states, was largely determined by economic conditions, the need of certain imports, and the desire of the leaders of industry to find new markets. The maxim that 'trade follows the flag' found many supporters in antiquity. Even though it is absurd to suppose that the conquest of Persia by Alexander or of Carthage by Rome was inspired by such considerations

(neither Macedonia nor Rome was at the time much interested in trade), yet the success of Alexander and Scipio must have been welcome to many who rejoiced to see the disappearance of barriers which had long hampered the free movement of commodities. To no class can the final success of Rome in forming a united Mediterranean Empire have given such satisfaction as to the traders of Italy and the provinces.

Enough has been said about the restrictions which were imposed on freedom of trade by the commercial policy of



#### IN PORT: GREEK SAILORS GOING ASHORE

The so-called Ficoroni casket found at Praeneste is engraved with pictures of the arrival of the Argonauts in Bithynia and gives illuminating details of Greek warship construction. Note the boarding ladder and the upper deck, which gave protection to the rowers in action and served as a lounge in idle hours.

*Kircheriano Museum, Rome*



#### CORINTH AND A DAUGHTER CITY

In this charming piece of metal work, a mirror found at Corinth, the male figure symbolises the great trading and manufacturing centre itself; the female, Leucas, a Corinthian colony.

*From Duruy 'Histoire des Grecs'*

Mediterranean states. It remains to say something of another hindrance to navigation from which the Mediterranean was never free until the time of Augustus. In his famous account of early Greece Thucydides explains that fear of pirates was the reason why the most ancient Greek states were built some distance from the sea. In early times piracy was a normal occupation, and it was no insult to ask a sailor whether he was a pirate; indeed various passages in the *Odyssey* convey the impression that in 'Homeric times' the distinction between a trader and a pirate was not too sharply drawn.

To Thucydides the existence of strong sea powers capable of dealing with this plague is an essential factor in the development of civilization. In the early days of Greece (he must be thinking of the 'dark age' which followed the Homeric period) there was no trade, no free intercourse by land or sea, and so men produced no more than the bare necessities of life; no great cities were built, no wealth was accumulated; life was insecure, and destruction and robbery were always to be feared. No state could be prosperous or wealthy if these conditions existed. The greatness of Crete in prehistoric days was due to sea power. Minos, the first 'Thalassocrat,' put down piracy, as was reasonable, to

the best of his power, in order that his revenues might be increased.'

His example was followed by the naval powers of historical Greece—Corinth, the Ionian cities and finally Athens—who found that without ships of war capable of keeping the seas open for their merchants trade was impossible. Fleets came into existence not for any offensive purpose, but for defence against piracy. Thucydides shows that the civilized states of Greece are those which have been able to defend themselves against raiders. Even in his own day the inhabitants of backward parts of Greece had to carry arms in ordinary times, and 'in many respects the life of ancient Greece was like the life of barbarians at the present day.'

This section of the Preface of Thucydides may fairly be regarded as a veiled apologia for the Athenian Empire, which was in his time regarded by many as an unjustifiable infringement of Greek liberty.

Under the protection of the Athenian navy communication by sea was possible for Greek merchants, at any rate in the Aegean area, to a far greater extent than before the rise or after the fall of the Athenian Empire; and it is not surprising that the warmest supporters of Athenian imperialism were found among the democratic trading population in Athens itself and in the allied cities. The pro-Spartan

'oligarchs' were usually agrarians, little interested in trade. An anonymous writer, contemporary with the Peloponnesian War, says that Athenian sea power enabled her not only to obtain good things from all over the world but to acquire a culture to which Greek and barbarian influences alike contributed. The disappearance of 'provincialism' which this writer notes as an effect of Athenian rule must have been found to a lesser extent in other cities of Greece; short as was the duration of the Athenian Empire, it produced a homogeneity in Greek culture which persisted long after the destruction of the Athenian fleet and power at the battle of Aegospotami, and left its mark on the new Greek states which Alexander's conquests created in the East. Athens anticipated on a small scale the work so efficiently performed

Trade dependent  
on sea power

by Rome; she broke down barriers which had long separated states from each other by facilitating the movement not only of commodities but of ideas.

If the Greeks had been more capable of co-operation they would have created some permanent machinery for dealing with the pirates instead of leaving the task to any state which happened to possess sea power. Even as it was, the venerable Amphictyonic Council, which was closely connected with Delphi, seems to have interested itself, ineffectively enough, in the matter. After the Persian Wars this body called on Athens to put an end to a nest of pirates in Scyros, but as a rule its efforts were confined to securing for pilgrims freedom of access to Delphi; these so-called 'Sacred Wars,' waged as they were for a definite and limited purpose, did little to foster unity among the



#### WHERE ATHENIANS CHECKED THEIR MEASURES

Standard measures are as important for trade as standard weights and currency. On this relief, commemorating the reduction of Samos by Athens in 439 B.C., the official fathom is given by the man's outstretched arms, and the foot by a footprint. The application of art to such practical ends is typical.

*National Museum, Athens*


Greeks. Delphi was inclined to take a side in Greek quarrels, and the Amphictyonic Council, like the League of Nations, had no troops to enforce its decrees.

Two examples from the early years of the fifth century illustrate the kind of experience which was apt to befall Greek traders at a time when the sea was inadequately policed. When a discredited leader of the anti-Persian movement in Asia Minor was unable to arrange his own return to Miletus, he persuaded the Lesbians to give him eight triremes, with which he sailed to Byzantium, and there 'captured all ships sailing out of the Pontus except those which were willing to take orders from him.' The other story may be given in the words of Herodotus:

When Dionysius of Phocæa knew that the fate of Ionia was sealed, he took three captured ships and did not return to Phocæa, knowing that it would be enslaved with the rest of Ionia, but sailed straight off to Phœnicia, sunk there some merchant vessels and took from them much money; then he departed for Sicily, where he established himself as a pirate, plundering no Greek vessels, but only Carthaginians and Etruscans.

It may be noted that these amateur pirates made straight for important points on well-marked trade routes, where they were sure to find victims. The unwillingness of merchants at this period of antiquity to venture across the open sea exposed them to the attentions of the pirates, who knew well that the deeply indented coast of southern Asia Minor provided them with hiding places close to which merchant ships were sure to pass.

Early in the Peloponnesian War the Athenians sent a squadron to this district to prevent 'Peloponnesian pirates' from



#### ATHENIAN STANDARD WEIGHTS

Fifteen public officers ('metronomoi') were in charge of weights and measures at Athens—ten at the Piræus and five at the capital, and these weights, of about 4 oz., 2 oz. and 4 lb., respectively, bear their official stamps.

*From Duruy, 'Histoire des Grecs'*

preying on merchant vessels coming to the Aegean from the east. It is probable that these 'pirates' ought rather to be described as privateers; that their vessels were privately owned; and that they had obtained some sort of sanction for their activities from the authorities at Sparta. As more recent history has shown, a state which is at war with a strong sea power is tempted to be unscrupulous in its methods.

During the Peloponnesian War not only Athenians but neutrals who were captured in merchant ships were indiscriminately put to death by their captors, who, we may suppose, did not always sail in regular ships of war. The encouragement of this policy by their opponents so infuriated the Athenians that as a form of reprisal they put to death in cold blood certain Spartan and Corinthian ambassadors, although Greek religious feeling normally regarded the persons of ambassadors as inviolate. Even before the collapse of the sea power of Athens, the Peloponnesian War must have enabled pirates to raise their heads again; they could easily claim to have the sanction of one of the belligerents, and the distinction between privateering and piracy has never been an easy one to draw.

When the war was over Sparta proved quite incapable of taking the place of Athens as policeman of the seas, and it is not long before we find Athens attempting to resume her old rôle. How difficult trade had been in the meantime is shown by the statements of the orators. One merchant, for instance, who was travelling to North Africa on business was attacked by pirates in the Argolic Gulf and robbed and murdered. The transference of valuables from South Russia to Athens was so risky that bankers were called upon to devise methods to render it unnecessary. Loans of money to merchants were only made at a high rate of interest in view of the risk from pirates.

The revival of the sea power of Athens in the fourth century was closely connected with her desire to secure free communication. When Philip of Macedon offered his co-operation in the suppression of piracy Athens regarded the offer almost as an insult, but we have abundant evidence

that at this date she did not display the same efficiency as in the time of Pericles, and that the activities of some of her own professional admirals, like Timotheus, were often unworthy of her professions.

If Alexander had lived longer, he would no doubt have taken steps to suppress piracy in the eastern Mediterranean, if only in the interests of the trade of Alexandria. But a period of chaos followed his death and none of the succession states proved capable of dealing with the evil. Something was no doubt done by Egypt during her period of ascendancy in the Aegean, but we hear more of the little state of Rhodes, which in the century after Alexander possessed a regular 'thalassocracy'; as early as 299 B.C. Delos paid her a sum of one thousand talents in order to be defended against the pirates. But Rhodes was not strong enough to carry on the work of Athens, and several pathetic stories of kidnapping and holding to ransom have come down to us from the third century B.C. Pirates who carried off women and children would not shrink from capturing merchant vessels.

In the west Carthage had no doubt suppressed piracy in the regions which she controlled. But in the fourth century B.C. Etruria seems to have developed into a regular **Pirates in the Far West:** Tyrrhenian becomes almost identical with 'pirate.' It has been doubted whether the Tyrrhenians who gave trouble in the Aegean were really Etruscans, but it was the latter with whom Dionysius of Syracuse dealt in the Adriatic; it was they who threatened a colony sent by Athens to this region in 325; and it was they who forced on Rome the creation of 'maritime colonies.'

Long before the first Punic War made Rome a great sea power she had regarded it as her duty to suppress marauders. As Professor Ormerod says in his excellent book on ancient piracy, 'the fact that the more incorrigible of the Italian pirates were compelled to extend their cruises far afield into the eastern seas, testifies to the efficiency of the measures adopted by Rome in home waters.' The steps which she took to deal with the piratical rulers in Illyria show that she did not

shrink from an attempt to dominate the Adriatic. The force of circumstances compelled a nation of farmers to become a sea power, which was destined ultimately to secure for traders in the Mediterranean a freedom of movement which they had never known before.

It is impossible to discuss the international trade of the ancient world without saying something about the machinery whereby it was financed. In a famous passage of the *Politics* Aristotle writes as follows: 'As the benefits of commerce were more widely extended by the import of commodities of which there was a deficiency and the export of those of which there was an excess, a currency was an indispensable device'; and he proceeds to describe accurately the two-fold functions of money, as a measure of value, and as a commodity which can always be exchanged for other commodities wanted by the holder. In the period with which we are concerned ancient commerce had advanced beyond the stage of barter, and was almost everywhere conducted on a money basis.

An abundant supply of a good metallic currency was, indeed, more essential to an ancient trader than to his successor in modern times, who has at his disposal not merely bank-notes but the great inventions of the cheque and the bill of exchange, of which, as we shall see, the ancients had only the most rudimentary ideas. Much of the evidence for the extent of ancient trade consists in finds of coins which were exported, for example, to northern Europe or to India in exchange for the produce of these regions.

Coinage was probably not a Greek invention, but in this matter the Greeks showed their usual power of assimilating the ideas of others. By the beginning of our period all the progressive Greek cities were accustomed to the use of money and possessed mints of their own, producing coins on a standard which was either



#### CURRENCIES THAT WERE WIDELY ACKNOWLEDGED

Currencies of several states besides Athens acquired international reputation—of Rhodes during her 'thalassocracy' in the 4th–2nd centuries, of Cyzicus owing to a monopoly allowed by the Persians in the 5th and 4th, of Chalcis and Corinth at most times owing to their extensive trade. Even Thebes succeeded for a time in imposing her mint on Boeotia.

*From Ward, 'Greek Coins,' John Murray*

identical with or stood in some definite relation to that employed in the states with which they had commercial dealings. Much may obviously be learned about the course of ancient trade by a study of the coinage systems which prevailed in the various communities.

The Greeks derived one great advantage from the fact that their commercial transactions were conducted on a metallic basis and that they were almost entirely ignorant of paper money. The value of their currencies remained stable over long periods, and unless, as rarely happened, a government embarked on a policy of depreciation, the money of one state was readily accepted by traders of another at a rate of exchange which could be determined by the scales. Although it was not till the Roman conquest that the Mediterranean world achieved monetary unity, trade was little hampered by the absence of a uniform system, and we find no parallel in the period under review to the collapse of certain European currencies in the present century with results so hampering to international trade.

At the same time it was of distinct advantage to ancient traders that the systems of coinage employed by the various commercial states should be as

few as possible, and all governments were aware of the fact. Commercial dealings between communities were facilitated by the adoption of the same standard. As early as the time of Solon we find Athens deciding to abandon the 'Aeginetan' system and to adopt as the basis of her coinage a standard which would encourage trade with the important cities of Chalcis and Corinth. It has, again, been established that during her period of supremacy in the Aegean she made a not unsuccessful effort to impose the use of her coinage on the states which she controlled. An extant decree orders the allies to surrender all non-Athenian coins in their possession, in exchange, presumably, for Athenian money of the same value. At the end of the Peloponnesian War in all probability the only silver coins which were legal tender at Athens were those on which was represented the familiar owl of Athena.

It is doubtful whether this action on the part of Athens caused much resentment. Athenian currency was popular because of its purity, and had a large circulation even in countries, such as South Italy and Sicily, over which Athens had no political authority. The money of certain other states, such as Corinth and Cyzicus, and later Rhodes, had an international circulation, but none was so popular as that of Athens even after her period of political greatness. Alexander struck silver coins on the Attic standard, adopted by most of the states into which his empire fell.

The kings of Persia made use of their political power to secure monetary uniformity, and monopolised the issue of the

gold 'Darics' which formed the most important gold currency in the Mediterranean world during the early part of our period, before they were superseded by the gold coins of Philip and Alexander. And just as great states such as Persia, Macedonia and Athens aimed at abolishing the chaos which was produced by a multitude of mints, so the smaller states which from time to time gained influence used their power for the same purpose. Thus Thebes for a considerable period managed to suppress the coinage of the other cities of Boeotia, in order that her own money might circulate throughout the country. Federal states, like the Olynthian and Achaean Leagues, had a federal coinage; and it seems probable that the short-lived alliance of the cities of Asia Minor against Persia at the beginning of the fifth century issued a coinage of its own.

In spite, however, of the fact that the common sense of ancient governments and traders did much to encourage commerce by reducing

as far as possible the **Money changers and number of currencies cash transactions in circulation at any** one time, there was always need for the money changers, whose tables were a familiar feature of all commercial centres. Payments were usually made in cash, and trade would have been impossible had not a supply of the currency required been easily obtainable. Again, although the standard of purity was fairly high, ancient coins, owing to the method by which they were produced, were not so uniform as those of modern times, and sometimes scales were needed to determine whether a coin was of full weight.

It is well known that modern deposit banking arose in the seventeenth century from the practice of depositing money and valuables for safe custody in the London goldsmiths' shops, where special facilities existed for the purpose, and that the money so deposited was often lent at interest provided that it could be called in before the time when the depositor demanded repayment. Greek banking, as we know it in the fourth century B.C., arose under exactly similar conditions.

It came to be the practice to entrust money for safe keeping to the money



ATTIC TETRADRACHMS

The monetary unit of Greece was the drachma, multiplied by 2, 4, etc. The Attic tetradrachm current throughout Greece c. 500-430 B.C. bore the head of Athena on the obverse and the owl and the abbreviated name of the city on the reverse.

British Museum

changers, who always had in their possession a large quantity of coin of various denominations for whose security they were bound to provide. Though even in fourth-century Athens it was customary to store what Englishmen, if not Frenchmen, would consider very large sums in private houses, the experiences of the victims of the Thirty Tyrants, in the period of confusion immediately after the fall of Athens, must have made obvious the desirability of some means of keeping savings out of the reach of depredators.

Again, many merchants whose headquarters were at Athens, but who were constantly abroad, found it convenient to deposit a sum of money with a banker not only for security but to facilitate the payment to creditors of any sums which might become due to them in the absence of the debtor. In course of time this side of a banker's activities assumed an increasing importance, and it was almost forgotten that he had originally acted as a changer of money. The conditions under which banking developed are illustrated by a story in Herodotus. A sixth-century Spartan named Glaucus, who was famed for his high character, was approached by a stranger from Miletus who asked him to take charge of half his wealth, which he had turned into money and brought to Sparta, thinking that in those disturbed times the Peloponnese was safer than Asia Minor. 'Do you accept my money,' he said, 'and take and keep this token; when anyone asks for the money, showing the same token, let him have it.' Unfortunately Glaucus proved unworthy of his reputation, and was adequately punished by Apollo of Delphi; but the story is instructive. If at the time there had existed



#### HOW PROPERTY WAS MORTGAGED

Mortgages were often recorded on a pillar set up on the property. This was in a field mortgaged by the husband of Hippoclea, niece of Demosthenes, as security for the marriage gift.

*From Durny 'Histoire des Grecs'*

institutions in which money was normally deposited for safe keeping, the Milesian would scarcely have had recourse to a complete stranger.

In early times it was common to deposit surplus money in the hands of temple treasurers. The temples were regarded as asylums where both persons and property were under divine protection. As it was an act of sacrilege to seize a suppliant, so robbery of a temple was strongly condemned by Greek religious feeling. It was therefore the custom for states, and notably the Athenian state, to deposit their savings in the temple of their patron deity, where it was treated as 'sacred money' which could only

be withdrawn under strict conditions, including the payment of interest by the government concerned.

There is no reason to think that in the fifth century B.C. the money stored in the Acropolis was invested or loaned by the temple authorities; so far was the temple from paying interest on deposits that the state paid the temple for the privilege of making use of it. But from the fourth century onwards it became quite a common practice for temples to lend money at interest, and in the latter part of our period we find Apollo of Delos providing large sums to needy communities at what was rather below the market rate of interest. The more important temples enjoyed very considerable revenues, and it is not surprising that they learned to invest their surplus income in loans and mortgages instead of keeping it shut up in a box.

In fourth-century Athens a man who wished to keep his spare money in safety would not have thought of entrusting it to a man like Glaucus or even of depositing



it in a temple. That part which he did not invest in mortgages or in commercial loans he deposited with a banker like Pasion, whose clientèle included very many merchants who were not Athenian citizens. A good example of everyday procedure at Pasion's bank is given by the orator Demosthenes.

A certain Lycon of Heraclea, who was on the point of undertaking a trading journey to North Africa, was introduced to Pasion by two Athenian citizens and opened an account with him, as we should say, into which he paid a considerable sum, giving instructions that it was to be handed over on demand to Cephisiades of Scyros, a business partner of his own, who at the time was away on some trading venture. Demosthenes continues:

The practice of bankers where money is deposited by an individual with instructions to pay it to another is as follows: first they enter in their books the name of the depositor and the amount of the money, then they write in the margin 'to be paid to so and so'; if they know the appearance of the latter, this is all they do, otherwise they also enter the name of the man who is to introduce the recipient of the money.

In the case before us neither of the persons concerned was a regular customer of the bank, and the money was merely deposited with Pasion for a few months for safe keeping. The procedure described is almost identical with that which would be adopted now, when a banker requires a reference for a new customer and hesitates to cash a cheque across the counter for a complete stranger.

The existence of banks like this must have been a great convenience for effecting payments between people who kept current accounts; a payment from one of Pasion's customers to another would have been merely a question of book-keeping, and it is possible that the Athenian bankers devised some sort of clearing-house to enable transfers of money between reputable customers to be made without unnecessary use of coin. A wealthy Athenian normally kept a certain amount of money on current account. On the death of Demosthenes' father it was found that he had 2,400

drachmae at the bank of Pasion and 600 at that of Pylades. It may be added that the modern practice of depositing valuables other than money at the bank was familiar to the Greeks.

In his book on Banking Dr. Leaf defined a bank as 'a person or corporation which holds itself out to receive from the public deposits payable on demand by cheque'; but he adds that this definition only applies to British banking, and is not applicable to the Continent, where the use of the cheque is less highly developed. In the period which we are considering a bank was usually owned by one man, and, though there are cases of partnership, anything like the modern joint-stock bank was unknown. Moreover, although it is often stated that Greeks were acquainted with the use of the cheque, a study of the evidence shows this to be very doubtful. Of course, it was quite usual to give instructions to a banker to pay a sum of money to a person on proof of identity, but it is difficult to find anything nearer a cheque than a token, like that mentioned in the story of Glaucus, or a sealed letter to the banker given by the debtor to the creditor. Even in Rome, in the second century B.C., to judge by the plays of Plautus, the usual practice was for the debtor to invite the creditor to accompany him personally to the bank to receive payment. It seems, then, that Dr. Leaf's definition of a bank must be considerably modified before it would apply to the ancient conditions.

In a discussion of ancient commerce it is necessary to ask how much was done by bankers to assist international trade otherwise than by changing money and by keeping in safety sums deposited with them by traders.

#### Financial Risks of Oversea Trade

We have seen above that navigation was often dangerous because of storms and pirates, and that there was every inducement to reduce as far as possible the amount of valuables carried on a journey. In the age of Cicero the letter of credit was well known—when his son was studying at Athens it was arranged that money should be paid to him on the spot—and some centuries earlier the underlying idea was familiar.

Isocrates (436-338 B.C.) tells us how the son of a wealthy noble in South Russia was anxious to have a remittance of money sent from home to Athens. 'Knowing that Stratocles was about to sail to the Pontus, I asked him to leave some of his own money here in Athens and recoup himself from my father in the Pontus, thinking that it would be a great advantage if my money were not exposed to the danger of a sea voyage, especially as the Spartans had then command of the sea.' When Stratocles asked him what would happen if the father refused to pay, Pasion agreed to make himself responsible for both principal and interest. Stratocles may be described as taking with him either a cheque drawn by the Bosphoran noble's son, or a letter of credit from Pasion; but the way in which the story is told shows that the procedure was unusual. Some have interpreted a passage in Theocritus to show that bankers in commercial towns were prepared to supply merchants who brought a written order with money of the country.

Great as were the services rendered by bankers to individual traders it is a mistake to employ modern terms too freely in speaking of their activities. A man like

**Modern Bills of Exchange** unknown Pasion, who had dealings with many foreigners and was well informed about their financial position, was able to give advice to Athenians engaged in foreign trade. But it would be wrong to imply that, except in a very rudimentary form, he performed the work of the accepting-houses who now facilitate foreign trade by guaranteeing the payment of bills drawn on foreign customers. It is indeed generally agreed that the modern bill of exchange was unknown in antiquity, even at a later period than that under review.

Again, there is little evidence that ancient bankers facilitated trade by lending money to merchants. Much trade was, indeed, done with borrowed money, and loans to those about to undertake a trading voyage were a favourite investment for capitalists. In these loans we may see the beginnings of insurance, as the sum borrowed was not repaid unless the ship reached its destination in safety.



But such loans, which produced a high rate of interest, were regarded as risky, and more evidence than exists is required to prove that bankers thought themselves justified in venturing their customers' money on such a speculation, whatever they may have done with their own.

On Pasion's death it was found that some of the funds deposited with him were invested in mortgages on land and houses in Attica. This form of investment was only open to bankers who were Athenian citizens, and we must suppose that funds entrusted to those who were only 'resident aliens' were lent on the security of other forms of property to men who could be trusted to repay their debt at a fixed date.

Enough has been said to show the general conditions under which commerce was conducted in the centuries with which we are more directly concerned. These Limitations to Trade Enterprise respects favourable, in others not.

We have seen that the geographical character of the Mediterranean area is such as to encourage the interchange of products, and that within it all necessities of life could be found. In spite of the jealous exclusiveness of certain governments there was always a market for goods, like Greek pottery, whose quality was recognized to be high. At the same time, even after Alexander's conquests, when the size of ships was greatly increased, navigation was limited to part of the year, and sailors were much more at the mercy of winds and currents than now.

Commercial enterprises were on a small scale and great accumulations of capital were rare. Merchants could borrow money only at rates which we should think extortionate, and were at most periods exposed to danger from pirates. But none of these handicaps prevented them from establishing close relations with customers in other lands or from settling in foreign countries. When Rome brought the whole of the Mediterranean under her rule, she was merely giving political unity to a civilization which had been built up and rendered homogeneous by the enterprise of a long succession of traders.



#### SUCCESSFUL RECOURSE TO GREEK MOTIFS IN BUILDINGS OF MODERN LONDON AND NEW YORK

Recent times have witnessed a revival in the use of Greek models, with greater discretion, perhaps, than was once customary. Using their derivative material in very different ways, both the Port of London Authority Building and the new General Post Office in New York achieve a dignified and imposing effect without copying any actual Greek building. The former shows a Greek sense of harmony in using classic details to adorn an entirely un-Greek structure; the pillars of the Corinthian colonnade in the latter retain their noble function of structural support instead of being merely decorative, as in baroque.

*Photos, Donald McLeish and Ewing Galloway*

# WHAT THE MODERN WORLD OWES TO GREECE

A Review of our Debt to Hellenic culture  
in Things Material and Things of the Spirit

By Rt. Hon. H. A. L. FISHER, LL.D. F.R.S.

Warden of New College, Oxford ; Author of *The Commonwealth, Bonapartism, Studies in History and Politics, etc.*

It has been said that almost all that lives and moves in the world outside the blind forces of nature is Greek in origin. The statement is clearly an exaggeration, for it takes no account of the intellectual and emotional forces which have gone to the making of Indian, Chinese and Japanese civilization ; but if we interpret the word ' world ' as meaning Europe and the sum of European influence in other continents, then the proposition is substantially true. The origins of European civilization are in fact to be found in ancient Greece, in the work of the Greek thinkers and artists who discovered Man, and first interpreted the riddles and displayed the beauties of nature.

It is hardly necessary to elaborate a proposition so well established. The science of mathematics and medicine, of politics, history and grammar, every branch of philosophy—metaphysics, logic, ethics, psychology—every ' genre ' in literature with the doubtful exception of satire, are Greek in origin. ' Alphabet,' ' school,' ' pedagogy,' these three Greek words are sufficient to remind us, even if we leave out of account the educational theories of Plato and Aristotle, that the Greeks were pioneers in the science and art of education. Theology is a Greek word and Christian theology, however much allowance may be made for Semitic influence, is essentially a product of the Greeks.

Hecataeus leads the way in history and geography ; Pythagoras invents the theory of numbers ; Democritus the theory of atoms ; Aristotle is the parent of zoology ; Theophrastus of botany ; Archimedes of hydrodynamics and mechanics. The science of astronomy was not, indeed, a Greek discovery, for the mysteries of the

starry heavens had attracted the intelligent curiosity of the Babylonians and Egyptians ; but the study of the stars and planets received developments at the hands of Greek men of science so great and far reaching as to amount to a revolution. It was a Greek who first discovered the sphericity of the earth, a Greek who first defined its dimensions and a Greek (Aristarchus of Samos) who first advanced the theory, long submerged by the intellectual domination of Aristotle, that the earth and planets revolve round the sun. In architecture, in sculpture and in the graving of gems Hellas found modes of expression, distinctive and unsurpassed.

As there was a Hellenic civilization extending far beyond the confines of ancient Greece, so there is now a European civilization influencing with varying degrees of completeness and intensity the life of Man in every quarter of the planet. This civilization has, as we have seen, its roots in the marvellous achievements of ancient Hellas and cannot be fully understood without reference to them. The descendant, however, often differs widely from his ancestors. He may enjoy different things, think different thoughts, live in a different way. So our modern civilization, though Greek in origin, may in all its essential characteristics be far removed from the qualities which we assign to the mind, character and institutions of Greece.

Outward contrasts leap to the eye. We live in an age of scientific machinery. Our material civilization is mechanical. Thanks to steam and electricity we move about the world far more swiftly, easily and frequently than our ancestors. If we



#### FLORIDITY OF BAROQUE

Baroque architecture, using classic details to express sixteenth-century tastes, can achieve quite pleasant effects; although the temple opposite shows that they are tiresomely florid by comparison with Greek art. This is the baroque church of S. Susanna, Rome.

*Photo, Atinari*

enumerate the outward features of modern society, they seem not only to be widely different from the conditions which prevailed in ancient Greece but very different from those which existed in the time of Dr. Johnson. The factory system is a novelty dating from the later part of the eighteenth century; the great city is a novelty; the nation state is a form of polity unrecognized by Aristotle. The Greeks, without books, newspapers, telephones, telegraphs or wireless, lived less on imitation and more on dialectic. The application of steam, chemistry and electricity to industry, commerce and agriculture are the fruits of modern, not of ancient ingenuity.

The British Parliament, save indeed for the important fact that it enshrines the principle of government by discussion, is an altogether different kind of institution from the Athenian Ecclesia, or Assembly of the People. Representative government is a medieval invention which has imposed itself as a necessity upon the modern world; but the Greeks knew nothing of

it. In their small civic communities it was possible for any citizen to take a direct share in the deliberative and judicial functions of the state, and he was expected to do so. All the complicated problems which arise in modern times out of the large area of our political units were foreign to the Greeks. They had not to consider the organization of local government, or the principles on which grants in aid should be allotted, or the relations between a member and his constituency. The scientific partition of social services between the central government and the local authorities was a problem from which they were entirely relieved.

Another contrast is supplied by a comparison of the social structure of the Hellenic and the modern world. The Greek city state was founded on a basis of domestic slavery, not greatly differing from that which prevailed in Cape Colony before 1833. The immensely complicated problems arising out of the relation of an employing and employed class equally endowed with political rights, but the one possessing the staying power supplied by capital, and the other dependent

**Greek & modern  
social structure**

for its subsistence upon weekly wages, did not then arise. Still less was there in those days any idea of international labour or international revolution. The phenomena of wealth were so feebly evidenced that a separate science of political economy was not thought of; nor indeed was it developed till the eighteenth century. The science of politics was not regarded, as it is too often now inclined to be, as part of the science of wealth but as part of the philosophy of ethics. Yet it is worth observing that Aristotle propounded the true theory of currency and saw through the fallacy of the mercantilists, who for many centuries led statesmanship astray by confounding money with wealth.

Though we are always tempted to under-rate the variety of the Greek genius and temperament, there is much in contemporary manifestations of art and literature which is alien to the Greek convention. In general, Greek art was simpler, more severe, less occupied with unessentials than ours and less liable to the vice of exaggeration.

The cubist and the futurist would appear to have had no analogies in ancient Greece; only a very expert literary detective could trace affinities between the artless open-air stories of pirates which form the theme of the Greek novelists and the elaborate study of morals and motives, relating to drab people leading uneventful indoor lives, which appears to be attractive to a sedentary and introspective age.


Music and melody are words bequeathed to us by the Greeks, but the development of the musical art in Europe owes less to them than to the Hebrews and less to the Hebrews than to the encouragement of music by the medieval Christian Church. As Sir Henry Hadow writes :

Greek music, it would appear, had no separate melody, no harmony, no instrumental writing, no better notation than alphabetical letters written above the verse, and the specimens which come down to us conform in no way to our standards of musical beauty. Yet there can be no doubt that it was an extremely subtle and delicate

art ; that it was full of technical distinctions which we cannot appreciate and of ethical principles which we cannot apply. Only one explanation seems to be possible—that it was not music in our sense of the term at all, but a special way of reciting poetry.

The Hebrews, too, appear to have lacked harmony and a system of musical notation, but they had at least independent melody and recognized the value of orchestral accompaniment. It is to the Hebrews that we probably owe the liturgical chant of the priest from which our Church music is derived. There is then little or no trace of Greek influence in our modern music, sacred or profane. Even part singing was unknown to the Hellenic world. Still more foreign would have been the elaborate technique of modern orchestration.

Very different is the case of architecture. Greek music has disappeared. Greek architecture remains, embodying certain definite types of beauty, which, so long as the sense of beauty remains with mankind, will continue to compel admiration. There



**DIGNITY OF THE ARCHITECTURAL MODELS BEQUEATHED BY GREECE**

Reproduced here chiefly for contrast with the baroque church opposite, to show what the art of more recent times both owes and does not owe to Greek inspiration, the temple 'of Concord' at Girgenti in Sicily is of interest on another count. It was converted into a church in the Middle Ages, a fact to which it owes its remarkable state of preservation to-day. Girgenti is the Greek Acragas.

*Photo, E.N.A.*

is probably no town in Europe which does not in some part of its structure betray evidence of the influence of Greece. Here we may find Doric, Ionic or Corinthian columns, here a spiral staircase, here a theatre—all theatres reveal their Greek original—or a stadium, here the close association of statuary with a public building, here a sculptured frieze or a panelled door. The new architectural forms which have risen since the decline of Hellenism, such as the Gothic, itself largely influenced from Byzantium, have supplemented rather than suppressed the message of Hellenic architecture.

In every course of architectural training the study of Greek models and the Greek tradition holds a place, so that wherever a house or a church or a town hall is built after an architect's plan, some hints from the technique of the schools of Hellas are distilled into the work. Russian architecture, indeed, has a character of its own, for the beautiful Greek monuments along

the northern shores of the Black Sea were only recovered in our own age; but wherever Greek models have been available they have supplied the formal elements of an architect's training. The United States of America is an architect's paradise. The patron has a bottomless purse. Nature is prolific in marbles, stones and woods of surpassing beauty and excellence. There is a prodigious demand for building of every kind. Yet, amidst a great variety and profusion of pattern, the art of Hellas holds its own. We may say the same of other parts of the new world. The colonnades of Delhi and Pretoria would not seem foreign to the philosophers of the Porch.


It follows that no history of architecture can fail to assign a large place to the Greeks. It is otherwise with painting. Not indeed that the Greeks were devoid of originality, skill or material resource in this department of the fine arts. Though we cannot, perhaps, invoke the frescoes of Cnossus, for



HOW THE PARTHENON COMPARES WITH THE BRITISH MUSEUM

Half the façade of the Parthenon set side by side with half the porch of the British Museum, on the same scale, shows the completeness of the debt owed by the latter to Greek architecture—its columns are taller and slenderer, because it has adopted the Ionic instead of the Doric order as its model. It must be remembered, however, that whereas the Parthenon is complete in itself, the British Museum porch is merely an architectural detail in a much greater whole.

*British Museum*



#### GREEK STYLES IN THE KIND OF SETTING FOR WHICH THEY WERE DEvised

The worst that can be said about the use of the classic style in northern cities is that their sooty atmospheres destroy the colour and texture of the stonework on which the beauty of Greek buildings so much depended. This criticism no longer applies in the clear bright air of the Transvaal, for instance; here we see the Ionic colonnade of the Government Buildings at Pretoria.

*Photo, E.N.A.*

these belong to an earlier age, there has survived on marble and terra-cotta, on the mummy portraits of the Ptolemaic period and on the walls of Pompeii enough of Greek painting to justify the belief that Polygnotus, Zeuxis and Apelles may have deserved the praises of Pliny. In the technical appliance of their art the Greeks were probably not inferior to the Italian artists of the Renaissance. They painted in fresco, in tempera and in 'encaustic' (see further under Chap. 68), and their palette was rich in colouring resource; but the great schools of Western Europe owe little to the Greek painters, unless, indeed, we concede that Byzantine art, which undoubtedly conquered the England of King Alfred and influenced the work of the Italian painters, was directly derived from the ancient Greeks.

The reason is obvious. The masterpieces of Greek painting had perished, and the remains which we now enjoy had not been unearthed at the Renaissance. The pictures of the great Italians do, indeed, bear the mark of Greek influence,

but this is derived not from painting, but from glyptic work. The winged genius of the Etruscan tomb reappears as an angel on the canvas of Perugino. The angle of the wings, the poise of the figure are unchanged.

Statuary, on the contrary, is still an essentially Greek art. The Greek influence, invading Rome in the Augustan age and triumphing over the native school of sculpture, achieved a second triumph at the Renaissance; but the superb models of antiquity which were rediscovered by the spade of the Italian antiquary had undergone a loss during the passage of time. The brilliant colour with which they had formerly been adorned had long since worn away, and it was natural to conclude that statues had been unpainted from the beginning of time. The thrill of excitement with which artists beheld the Laocoon at the beginning of the sixteenth, and the Elgin marbles at the beginning of the nineteenth century persists to this day. The greatest masterpieces of Greek sculpture have never been excelled. They remain models for





## ETRUSCAN SPIRIT AND CHRISTIAN ANGEL

The resemblance between the works of the Italian masters and certain Etruscan objects is so marked as to make certain that the contents of Etruscan tombs were available for study. Compare this winged spirit on a bronze mirror (left) with an angel of the painter Perugino (1446-1524); the altitudes are almost identical.

From Ducati, 'Dei Arte Etrusca' (left)

imitation. And if we ask what, besides sheer technical skill, has given them this amazing predominance; we should answer that it is an exact knowledge of the human form combined with an ideal of human beauty and a complete absence of all affectation. 'The Greeks,' as Nietzsche observes, 'were, like genius, simple. Therefore they are the eternal teachers.'

It is a tribute to Hellas that we take the plastic arts for granted. If Europe had been overrun by the Mongols, the Turks or the Moors, the artistic impulse of the Latin and Teutonic world might have found no expression in painting or sculpture. It is to the Greeks, then, that we owe not only the knowledge of Man, but his idealisation in art. It is they who applied the skill of the architect, the sculptor and the painter to the exaltation of civic pride and the worship of the gods. And wherever taste is apt to go astray through exuberance, or eccentricity, or vain conceit, there lies in the masterpieces of Greek art the necessary and salutary reproof.

One of the standing contrasts in literary criticism and history is that between the classical and romantic schools. The contrast implies that the ancient literature of Greece and Rome exercises a continuing influence over certain types of mind or temperament, or rather that it contains, as regards both form and substance, elements

of value. There is a further implication in the term; it is that a certain identity of craftsmanship can be discerned in the two literatures of Greece and Rome. The measure of that identity has been variously stated. Mommsen even went so far as to say that Latin literature was nothing but a translation from the Greek. This is exaggerated. What is true is that the great masters of Latin literature modelled themselves upon the Greeks and endeavoured to recapture their spirit. Without Homer there would have been no Vergil, just as without Vergil there would have

been no Dante. But Vergil is not a copy of Homer any more than Dante is a copy of Vergil. Still, it would be true to say that the most perfect examples of what we know as the classical spirit are to be found in the literature of ancient Greece. What are its qualities? Simplicity, grace, **Classical Spirit** restraint in emotion, an **in literature** unflinching instinct for beauty, concision of phrase. A literal translation into English prose of a poem in the Greek anthology cannot fail to be more verbose than the original, and strikes the reader often as being bare to the point of plainness. Now, concision is a great source of carrying power. 'We do not exercise authority,' as St. Just said, 'without laconism.'

In the modern world, so full of bustle, complexity and refinement, there are many forces at war with this beautiful but austere tradition. Nevertheless, it holds its own among competing forms of literary art; more easily in some languages than in others, but is manifest in all countries in which there is a sense of polite convention or of human dignity. What pastoral poetry from Lycidas to Thyrsis and The Scholar Gipsy has not been inspired by the Idylls of Theocritus? How few great poets have not, in some part at least of their work, owned the power of Greek

models? Goethe's *Werther* is not a classical document, no more is his *Faust*, but *Iphigenie* is a determined attempt to emulate Sophocles on his own ground, and Ueber allen Gipfeln has all the immortal brevity and restrained pathos of a lyric from the Greek anthology.

This last instance is the more remarkable since in general it is in the domain of lyric poetry that it has been found most difficult to conform to the spirit of the ancient writers. Wordsworth's

A slumber did my spirit steal,  
I had no human fears.  
She seemed a thing that could not feel  
The touch of earthly years

might be Greek, and there is much in the lyrical work of Milton, Gray, Shelley, Keats, Arnold, A. E. Housman and Bridges which is clearly inspired by Greek example; as there is, too, in Ronsard and Du Bellay, in Hérédia and in Carducci. The modern lyric, however, is apt to be more lavish in ornament and introspection.

The famous rules of dramatic art—the three unities prescribed by Aristotle—dominated the theatre of Racine and Corneille and cannot anywhere be disregarded without some sacrifice. The Romans dropped the Greek chorus, and though music has been associated with acting in modern times in the opera and musical comedy, the development of a modern tragedy is no longer assisted or retarded by a combination of music and dance, poetry and moralising. But it is perhaps too soon to estimate the effect which revivals of Greek plays may exercise upon the dramatic art of the future. If we except Shakespeare and Racine, the great tragic rôles for women are all Greek.

Greek metres—the hexameter and elegiac, the alcaic and the sapphic—are still practised, though seldom, even

by such masters as Goethe and Tennyson and Clough and Carducci, with convincing success; but in truth the poetical expression of classical feeling does not necessarily demand the employment of the classical metres. The French Alexandrine, the English blank verse, the sonnet, in the hands of such artists as Ronsard, Du Bellay and Hérédia, the quatrain as it is written by A. E. Housman, may enshrine the quintessential spirit of ancient Greece. We no longer debate, as in the seventeenth century, the comparative claims of the Ancients and Moderns. We recognize with Daniel that 'all our understandings are not built by the square of Greece or Italy, and that we are children of nature as well as they.'



MODEL FOR RENAISSANCE SCULPTORS

The measure of the vitality of Greek art can be gauged by the excitement following the discovery of the Laocöon group in Rome in 1506. It is a thoroughly inferior piece of late Hellenistic work, but it was sufficient to light a blaze of interest in Greek sculpture and cause an artistic renaissance.

Photo, Anderson

The kind of artificial classical despotism which was enforced by authority in France during the eighteenth century is never likely to be revived. Yet the Greek spirit will always claim its votaries so long as the love of beauty and freedom and reticence are not extinct in the world. In every age there will be men and women who are natural Hellenists. They may be ignorant of the Greek alphabet. They may never have read Plato or Homer even in a translation, but in virtue of an innate affinity with the spirit of Hellas they will prefer the use of reason to its surrender, will pursue beauty rather than ugliness, simplicity rather than complication, concision rather than verbosity, and in all their thoughts will express this free and balanced temper.

Ever since the days of Erasmus the study of the Greek language and literature has played a conspicuous part in British education. It was reserved for the present generation to witness the abolition of compulsory Greek at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the partial displacement of Greek by Modern Studies in many of the public schools. But if Greek no longer holds the privileged position in Britain which belonged to it in the Victorian age, there is no sign of any decline in the interest aroused by Greek studies. On the contrary there has been a kind of Hellenic renaissance, partly owing to a remarkable series of literary and archaeological discoveries associated with the names of Schliemann, Evans, Grenfell,



BY A DISCIPLE OF CLASSICISM

The classical dominates all the sculptures of Jacopo Sansovino of Florence (1477-1570), who made a copy of the Laocoon. There is little of genius in them, but this Bacchus shows what could be achieved even with his models.

National Museum, Florence; photo, Alinari

Hunt, Hogarth and Myres, and partly because the interpretation of the masterpieces of Greek drama has fallen into the hands of a dynasty of scholars who have combined exact knowledge with rare poetic insight. Such names as those of Henry Butcher, A. W. Verrall, Gilbert Murray, J. W. Mackail and J. S. Phillimore may be cited in evidence. There is probably more appreciation of Greek poetry and Greek art now in Britain, and more opportunity of seeing the masterpieces of Greek tragedy represented on the stage, than at any previous period.

There is then no reason to expect that the influence of Greek thought and literature will be diminished by educational changes. Much of that influence is already preserved in the masterpieces of English poetry, so that even if the knowledge of the Greek language were to die out altogether in our schools and universities, or to become as rare as the

acquisition of Arabic, we should still have access to the Greek spirit through Milton and Shelley and Keats, through Wordsworth and Tennyson and Matthew Arnold, apart from poetical translations, apart from the visible memorials of Greek architecture and Greek sculpture and the all-pervasive influence of Greek thought in the words of modern philosophers and men of science. The loss of 'a musical and prolific language' that gives, in Gibbon's words, 'a soul to the objects of sense and a body to the abstractions of philosophy' would be an appreciable impoverishment of our educational resources.

Every country is the richer for having in its midst a priesthood of Hellenists and a circle of disciples who can taste the full beauty of Greek poetry in the original. Yet ancient Greece would survive without the priesthood and without the disciples, for it is an inalienable part of our common heritage as Europeans.

One of the intellectual characteristics of our age is the spread of the historical spirit. 'Vere scire est per causas scire'

(true knowledge is knowledge of causes) is the watchword of every serious student. A phenomenon, natural or political, is best understood through its history. We regard the world as a sequence of cause and effect, and since Turgot clearly formulated a law of progress in 1750, it is a widespread belief that while history never repeats itself, the panorama of human life upon this planet reveals a spectacle of improvement. Such ideas were only fitfully present to the minds of the Greek historians. They had no firm conception of a continuous law of progress or of an iron chain of causality. They thought that the caprices of Fortune or Chance had a large share in moulding the destinies of men, that history went round in cycles, and that since situations repeated themselves, the study of the past afforded valuable instruction to statesmen.

Yet the debt which historiography owes to the Greeks is incalculable. It is not every race which possesses the commemorative instinct. More than three hundred million people in India are without it. But the Greeks loved to recall the memory of famous men. 'To sing the glorious deeds of men' was the original purpose of the Muse. They thought human life a vivid, interesting, exciting thing, an experience worth living and worth recording. It gave entertainment and, as Thucydides saw, it provided political and moral lessons as well. 'The accurate knowledge of what has happened,' says Thucydides, 'will be useful because according to human possibility similar things will happen again.'

The idea that history should be accurate and fair, that it should be serious, disengaged from myths and trivialities,

that it should deal with the life of the state, and be helpful in enabling political needs to be better understood and political work to be more intelligently undertaken—all these conceptions are present to Thucydides, and have gone to the making of our modern schools of history. Let us not accept the opinion that this rational view of historiography was inevitable. For many centuries the Greek idea was lost; and the measure of that loss will be present to the mind of anyone who compares even the best monastic chronicles of the Middle Ages with a page of Thucydides or Polybius. But with the recovery of Greek learning at the Renaissance history was recalled to the ancient models.

All our Western philosophy derives from Greece. It was the Greeks who first asked the ultimate questions: What are matter and form and motion, what is justice, what is happiness? It was they who first liberated European thought from the bondage of religious ritual and applied to the exploration of the fundamental problems of existence the free, unfettered activity of the human intellect. Thus it would be impossible to find a system of modern philosophy which has not its seeds in the Greek faculty for wonder. Even schools of thought such as Pragmatism, which have no analogue in the surviving monuments of Greek speculation, are compelled to work with categories which the Greeks were the first to discover and define.

It is not without significance that the word 'psychical' is Greek, for the conception of the soul as the spiritual substance of Man's Soul a human personality was a Greek Discovery Greek discovery. It was Socrates who first taught the Athenians that it was part of their duty to care for the soul or 'psyche,' and that the secret of moral health lay in self-examination. For him, as for the Greeks in general, philosophy was not so much an academic study as a way of life. The philosopher examined his own soul and brought others to the test. His discourses were full of ethical direction, prefiguring the Christian sermon of later times, save that the 'hortative discourses' of the Hellenes were free of theological sanctions and appeals. All that we mean by the

science of ethics, most of what is implied in the ethical basis of European religion, finds a root in the Socratic teaching. Of all the achievements of the Greek genius this discovery, the source and sustenance in every generation of so many saintly lives, has been the most important in its bearing on the conduct of man. We can trace its influence in the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius and the *Confessions* of S. Augustine, in the confessional of the Catholic Church and the casuistry of the Jesuit Order, and more broadly in the conceptions of conscience and duty, which, whether they be acted on in individual cases or not, are part of the moral climate of Western civilization itself.

It will be urged that the ethics of the modern world owe more to the influence of Christianity than to any other spiritual source; and it is true that the Christian scale of virtues is different from the Greek. But then we have to ask, what does Christianity itself owe to the Greeks? Dr. Charles has shown that the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, which contains an ethical passage closely resembling the Sermon on the Mount, was a pre-Christian document. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul was Greek, not Jewish; so, too, was the doctrine of the Word or 'Logos,' which informs the Johannine Gospel. That there was a close connexion between early Christianity and the Greek mystery religions is now generally acknowledged. The idea of a sacred rite or sacrament by which the soul was purged of sin belongs to the Orphic tradition, to which source also may be traced the conceptions of hell, purgatory and heaven characteristic of medieval and popular Christianity.


Some critics have described Christianity as a decaying form of Hellenism, others as the last and most triumphant expression of the Hellenic genius, others again have sought to extend the Hebraic as against the Hellenic influences in the religious creed of the modern world, and to find in Jewish conceptions authority for the Catholic Mass. All, however, would agree that the contribution of Greek thought to Christian theology has been decisive. The extreme claim is made by Dean Inge, who traces

back to Plato 'the religion and the political philosophy of the Christian Church and the Christian type of Mysticism.'


There are some features of modern Christianity which would have been profoundly alien to the Greek of the age of Plato and Aristotle. The Greeks were in bondage neither to a book nor to the instruments of a church. The crudities of fundamentalism would have been unintelligible to them and they had nothing to fear from sacerdotal tyranny. The Christian Science service, in which alternate passages are read out from writers differing so widely in spiritual force and literary merit as S. Paul and Mrs. Eddy, would have seemed to them bad art, bad religion, bad philosophy and bad science. The prodigal emotions, it is true, of a Welsh revivalist meeting, the 'chorybantic Christianity' of the Salvation Army, would not have seemed so foreign to the author of the Bacchae or to the votaries of Dionysus. 'Ecstasy' and 'enthusiasm' are Greek words illustrating ideas deeply rooted in the popular religions of Hellenism. But the higher religious consciousness of the Greeks was not a mere movement of sensibility; it was compounded alike of metaphysics, ethics and the emotion of piety. To it Protestant nonconformity would have seemed deficient in metaphysics, Greek monasticism in metaphysics and ethics alike, Roman Catholicism in intellectual freedom, and all the churches to be too deeply involved in questions of politics and organization to be free for the sublime contemplation of divine ideas. Only in some phases of Christian mysticism would the Greek discover a reflection of the soul of Plato or in the sterner forms of Calvinism an analogue to that valiant austerity of conduct which was preached by the Stoic moralists among the splendours and luxuries of Rome.

The language of the New Testament is Greek. Recent archaeological investigation, which has unearthed much new literature of the first century, has enabled the sense of many of the words used in the Gospels and Epistles to be determined for the first time with nicety. The fact serves to remind us that the new religion found

Deficiencies of  
modern cults



At Bradfield College in Berkshire a small theatre on the Greek plan has actually been built for the performance of Greek plays by the students. This view shows Croon, king of Thebes, lamenting at the bier of his son Haemon at the conclusion of the *Antigone* of Sophocles.



In nothing is the debt to Greece more obvious than the theatre. The structure of the building itself, the names applying to it—theatre, scene, orchestra—and all types of dramatic performance with their names—drama, comedy, tragedy, even pantomime—are derived from Greece. Modern interest in this derivation is shown by revived performances of Greek plays in the Greek manner; above is a scene from *The Clouds* of Aristophanes staged in the ancient Greek theatre at Syracuse.

**MODERN HOMAGE TO THE GENIUS THAT GAVE BIRTH TO DRAMATIC ART**

its adherents in a world speaking the language and thinking the thoughts characteristic of Greek civilization. In a thousand subtle ways, incapable of being discerned after so many centuries, Greek influence shaped and informed the new Creed.

The idea of a number of organized churches, some established, others disestablished, but all tolerated and co-existing in the same state, would have been

contributions; but the springs of the river descend from Hellas. It is to the thinkers of Greece that the credit belongs of rising above the low levels of popular polytheism, of drawing the contrast between the flux of material things and the realm of ideas, and of finding in the nature of thought itself the divine principle in the universe.

It is significant that Thomas Linacre



#### HIGH PRIESTS OF THE MODERN CULT OF HELLENISM

The rarest gifts that Greece has bequeathed to the world are incapable of illustration, for they are not masses of lifeless architecture, but things of the spirit. Misunderstood for centuries by painters of classical subjects and distorted by over-emphasis even in the writings of such as Winckelmann, Hellenism is now being appreciated at its true value through the labours of men like Samuel Henry Butcher (left, 1850-1910), A. W. Verrall (1851-1912), Prof. Gilbert Murray and Prof. J. W. Mackail.

*Photos, Elliott & Fry, and Clarke, Cambridge*

quite foreign to Greek experience. In the ancient Greek city, State and Church were one, and if the citizen were guilty of impiety he would be punished, not by a priesthood or a church, but by the authorities of the city. The doctrine of Henry VIII, the true founder of the Anglican Church, would not have been wholly alien to the Greeks, for though a state church was unknown to them, a state religion was familiar.

To the Jews God was a great historical figure guiding the fortunes of his chosen race and demanding from them the tribute of awe and devotion. To the Greek philosophers the Divine Being was capable of metaphysical proof, being conceived by Plato as self-moved motion or as the soul which was the source of cosmic order, and by Aristotle as the form which gives purpose and intelligibility to matter. The metaphysics of theism have a long history to which Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Bradley, Pringle-Pattison and others have made specific

and John Caius, the two founders of scientific medicine in England in the first half of the sixteenth century, were both distinguished for their translations from the classics of Greek medicine. The Greek physicians lacked much which is now ours by inheritance. They had no knowledge of dissection, or of the circulation of the blood, or of bacteriology and antiseptic surgery. They had no microscopes or stethoscopes or X-rays. Nevertheless they left in the two great bodies of medical literature which are associated with the names of Hippocrates (circa 460 B.C.; see Chap. 48) and Galen (A.D. 131-201; see Chap. 71) a mass of medical experience and doctrine which was not only far in advance of the Arabic medicine so widely practised in Europe in the early Middle Ages, but still commands the admiration of modern experts.

The Hippocratic physician brought to his task a high sense of professional honour, a perception that the art of healing

Medical debt to  
Greece

involved moral as well as physical considerations, a power of exact observation and an alert, vigilant, experimenting intelligence. Whether we read the clinical records of the Hippocratic corpus or the directions for the preparation of the operating table, or the famous medical aphorisms, or the prescriptions for the treatment of fever, we feel that we are in a very modern atmosphere and that the Greek physician in the little island of Cos four or five hundred years before Christ would in nine cases out of ten have been as safe and sensible a medical adviser as many an English country practitioner to-day. Certainly, the good Hippocratic physician would have been more competent than any of the medical men who attended Charles II during his last illness, or were ridiculed in the famous comedy of Molière. Indeed, we learn from Dr. Singer that 'the dietetic principles of the Hippocratics, especially in connexion with fever, are substantially those of the present day, and that the general medical tendency during the last generation has been to approximate more closely to the Hippocratics.'

The Greeks, in a word, brought the dry light of common sense into the realm of medicine, and went as far as common sense would carry them. We

Common sense owe them much. For applied to medicine centuries Hippocrates and Galen were the leading text-books in our schools of medicine, accepted here, challenged and overthrown there, but always affording an incentive to thought and experiment. It is on the basis of these old Greek writings that the modern science of medicine in Britain and, indeed, in all other European countries, has been erected.

What is true of medicine applies also to other branches of science. The Greeks had the genuine scientific temper. They observed minutely and they speculated boldly, saluting novelties with rapture and carrying their keen inquiring spirit into everything without the restraint of taboos. Never has there been such a concentration of first-class human intelligence upon the facts of nature as during the age which begins with Thales and ends with Aristotle. All that rationalism could achieve with the means then at its disposal

was accomplished. In mathematics, where the human mind operates so to speak 'in vacuo,' the Greeks achieved miracles, and one of their text-books on geometry, written by Euclid, has held its own in our schools almost to the present day (see further under Chap. 7x).

We have now many branches of knowledge, such as chemistry and electricity, which were unknown to Hellas. Yet were the ancient Greeks to come to life again, the world would offer nothing so attractive as a Greek idea or congenial to them as the present state of science pure and applied. It would be idle to pretend that modern scientific engineers find it necessary to resort to the speculations of the Ionians or of Aristotle; but the spirit of free scientific inquiry first arose in Greece and there also were laid the foundations of those essential departments of human knowledge upon which all scientific advance is built. In this sense every modern laboratory owes an inextinguishable debt to ancient Greece.

Politics is a Greek word; so too is much of our political terminology Greek. Polity and democracy, aristocracy and oligarchy, monarchy and tyranny, Greek words all of them, remind us that the main categories of political science were Greek also. Yet it may well be asked what we have yet to learn or in what way we can be influenced by these ancient communities, without books or newspapers, who dwell in towns which were little more than overgrown villages, hibernating in winter, living in the street and the market-place during the summer months, and passionately absorbed in the affairs of their own city. The answer is that though institutions and fashions change, human nature does not. The chatter of Gorgo and Praxinoë in a street crowd at Alexandria might be heard in Oxford Street to-day. The wit of Aristophanes still preserves its savour.

The Greek idea of political greatness is our idea also. Most of the fundamental problems of modern politics, such as the war of classes, the representation of divergent interests, the comparative merits of different types of constitution, were problems for the Greeks also, are illustrated in Greek history and discussed by Greek philosophers. It is then no paradox to



assert that the outlines of political philosophy can be more easily learned from Greek than from modern history. The conditions were simpler; the field more limited; the ultimate passions, upon which political movements depend, were capable of being isolated with greater clarity.

Of all the political lessons bequeathed by the Greeks to the moderns the most valuable is the idea of the nobility of public service. The

**Nobility of Public Service** Greeks took a spiritual view of the state. They regarded it not as a commercial association for the purpose of material gain, but as a community by participation in which the citizen was able to realize all that was best in his nature. Good citizenship was essential to the good life; patriotism was part of virtue; it was only by service to the state that man was enabled to fulfil his purpose. The Greeks, in other words, contributed an ethical exaltation to the idea of political life which, whenever classical influences have been specially prevalent in the world, has inspired good men to spend themselves in the service of their country. A Greek writer of the first century of our era exhibited the idea of civic greatness in a series of brilliant biographical sketches, and Plutarch's *Lives*, which inspired the men of the Renaissance and of the French Revolution, has perhaps done more than any other single book to fix the idea of public service, as something worthy of the highest human ambition, in the modern mind.

Another idea promoted by the revived study of classical literature in Western Europe after the Renaissance is that of the Republic. Varchi, Algernon Sydney, Madame Roland, to cite a Florentine, a British and a French example, were prompted by Hellenic associations. The triumph of the French Republic in the age of Pitt and Fox was assisted by the speculations and histories of ancient Greece.

The government of a Greek city was direct, not representative. Is it then to the Greeks that we owe the spread of direct government in Switzerland, in the United States and in Republican Germany, through the instrument of the Referendum, the Initiative and the Recall? The

answer is in the negative. If representative government in these countries has been supplemented by direct appeal to the people, it is due to the diminishing authority and prestige of parliamentary assemblies and to the spread of political education and interest among the masses.

The modern conceptions of state socialism would have seemed quite familiar to the Greeks; for while they believed in political freedom, in the sense in which freedom is opposed to the caprice or force of the autocrat, they had no aversion from an all-pervasive regulation of private life in the common interest by the community as a whole. The conceptions of Adam Smith and Ricardo are more alien to Greek thought than those of Sidney Webb and Ramsay MacDonald.

The idea of individual sacrifice for public ends appealed to them; and the state which most attracted the admiration of Aristotle was that in which the predominance of public over private interests was most clearly marked.

The predominance of political motives affected the Greek idea of education. The young citizen should be educated for citizenship. Education was far too important a matter to be left to private-venture schools. It was the duty of the state to see that the children of its citizens were well brought up in such a way as to serve the ends of the city. In such an ideal a narrow specialism, whether religious or intellectual or industrial, had no place. Body, character and intellect must receive their appropriate discipline. To the fine arts, and more definitely to music, there was attributed a special virtue in ethical education.

The provision made for public education in Great Britain is framed on these principles. There is nothing in the code of the Board of Education from which Plato or Aristotle would have dissented. Indeed, the idea that education should be a matter of state concern, that it should be general and not one-sided, that it should involve the training of the body and the senses as well as of the mind, and that it should be so ordained as to fit its recipients to take their place in the community, 'to

do their duty in that state of life to which it shall please God to call them,' is now prevalent throughout the Western world. In some countries too little attention is paid to physical and social training, in others to the training of character; but in all the principle is acknowledged that the true object of education is the whole man and not a special group of faculties.

One distinction, however, must be noted. When the Greeks thought of state education, they contemplated a boon to be extended to a privileged class of citizens only. From this boon the slave population, which supplied those rudimentary economic services without which the state would have perished, was excluded. In the modern world the prerogative of a limited class has become the privilege of the whole people, and the critics of public education are not so much concerned with its shortcomings as an instrument for fashioning the leaders of thought and action, as with the policy of extending to manual workers at great public expense an education which may be inappropriate to their needs.

Greek influence admits of no narrow definition. We think of the Greeks as the supreme rationalists, and of free philosophical speculation as their greatest gift to Man; but hardly has the mind touched

on that aspect of the Greek legacy, when other facets of Greek influence strike upon the glass of memory and we recall the scholastic philosophy of the medieval Church, based on the speculations of Aristotle; the history of Pantheistic doctrine passing from a section of Aristotle's *De Anima* (On the Soul), through Averroes to the West; the mystical doctrines of Orphism and their influence on Christian religion and the art and poetry of the Middle Ages. In the brilliant and versatile civilization of Hellas everything was possible save stupidity and ugliness. The word athlete is Greek and the modern cult of cosmopolitan athleticism may invoke the authority of the Olympic games, the oldest, the most enduring and the most famous of the world's athletic fixtures. Yet if we are naturally prone to emphasise the athleticism which prevailed among the Greeks, it is to be remembered that they also had their ascetics, and that they openly indulged in a practice which is now regarded as supremely decadent.

The true influence of Hellas, however, depends not upon its weakness but upon its strength. From this corner of the Mediterranean Sea there issued a series of thinkers, poets and artists who touched the summit of human genius.



#### ATHLETIC MEETING THAT REVIVES THE IDEA OF THE OLYMPIC GAMES

During the holding of the Olympic games there was a truce between the Greek city states; and partly to promote the international amity thus symbolised the games, suppressed as a pagan practice in A.D. 394, were revived in 1900. However, the fifth gathering, to have been held at Berlin in 1916, did not take place. This photograph shows the competitors—strangely muffled up with clothing, a Greek would have said—in the final of the 5,000 metres at the 1920 Antwerp meeting.

# SYNCHRONISED TABLE OF DATES

<i>Rome and the West</i>		<i>Greece and the East</i>	
B.C.			B.C.
279	Pyrrhus in Italy; Roman defeat at Heraclea.	Philetærus at Pergamum.	280
278	Pyrrhus defeats Romans at Asculum.	Galic invasion of Greece repulsed at Delphi.	279
276	Rome-Carthage alliance. Pyrrhus goes to Sicily.	Antigonos Gonatas becomes king of Macedon.	278
277	Pyrrhus campaigning in Sicily.	Gauls invade Asia Minor.	277
276	Pyrrhus returns to Tarentum.	Gauls defeated by Antiochus.	276
276	Pyrrhus, defeated at Beneventum, quits Italy.	War between Pyrrhus and Antigonos.	274
275	First treaty between Rome and Egypt.	India: Asoka succeeds to the Maurya kingdom.	273
273		Death of Pyrrhus at Argos ends war.	
272	Surrender of Tarentum; end of Samnite war.		
271	Hiero of Syracuse besieges Mamertines in Messina.	Eumenes of Pergamum defeats Antiochus I.	268
268	Military colonies at Ariminum and Beneventum.	Antiochus I killed in battle with Gauls (Galatians).	261
264	Mamertines appeal to Rome. Beginning of the First Punic War, 264-241.	India: Asoka's Kalinga War.	
262	Hiero makes peace and alliance with Rome.	India: Asoka's conversion to Buddhism.	269
262	Romans capture Agrigentum (Agragas).	India: 'Kalinga' and 'Rock' edicts of Asoka.	267
260	Rome builds fleet. Naval victory of Mylæ.	Bactria under Diodotus revolts against Antiochus II.	255
259	Romans invade Africa; Carthage hard pressed.		
255	Xanthippus at Carthage. Defeat of Regulus.	Aratus of Sicyon joins and heads the Achaean League.	251
254	Romans capture Panormus.	Rise of Parthians led by Arsaces.	249
253	Great Roman fleet lost in a storm.	India: Asoka's Buddhist mission to Ceylon.	
250	Romans reject Carthaginian offer of peace.	China: End of Chou Dynasty.	249
249	Naval defeat of Romans at Drepanum.	Tiridates (to 211) chief of Parthians.	248
247	Hannibal Barca in Sicily. Birth of Hannibal.	Accession of Ptolemy III Euergetes in Egypt.	247
		Accession of Seleucus II Callinicus in Syria.	246
		Syrian war of Ptolemy and Seleucus.	246
		Liberation of Corinth by Aratus.	245
242	Naval defeat of Hanno at Aegadian Islands.	India: 'Pillar' edicts of Asoka.	240
241	Sicily, except Syracuse, becomes a Roman Province.	Attalus I succeeds Eumenes at Pergamum.	241
	Insurrection of Carthaginian mercenaries.	Great defeat of Galatians by Attalus.	240
239	Birth of Ennius.	Death of Antigonos Gonatas of Macedon.	239
238	War with Boii renewed (after forty-five years).		
	Carthage surrenders Sardinia to Rome. End of Carthaginian Mercenary war.	Cleomenes III king of Sparta.	238
236	Rome makes peace with the Boii.	India: Death of Asoka; Maurya empire divided.	232
	Hannibal founds Carthaginian empire in Spain.	Illyrian pirate states.	230
231	Sardinia and Corsica made one province.	Accession of Antigonos Doson in Macedon.	229
230	Rome declares war on	Demetrius of Pharos left in control of Dalmatian coast.	
	Illyrian war; Coreysa, etc., come into Roman alliance;	Games. Negotiations with Greek states.	228
228	Rome admitted to the Isthmian		
	Boundary agreement with Hasdrubal in Spain.	War of Cleomenes and Achaean League.	227
	New Carthage founded.		
226	Italy threatened by a general Gallic rising.	Reforms of Cleomenes at Sparta.	225
225	Roman victory over Gauls at Telamon.	Aratus calls in Antigonos Doson.	224
224	Submission of Boii.	Accession of Antiochus III the Great in Syria.	223
223	Submission of Cisalpine Gaul to Rome.	Accession of Ptolemy IV Philopator in Egypt.	223
221	Death of Hasdrubal; Hannibal acclaimed by army.	Battle of Sellasia; fall of Cleomenes.	221
		China: Shih Hwang Ti creates New Empire.	
		Accession of Philip V in Macedon; alliance with Achaean against Antiochian League.	220
		China: Building of the Great Wall by Shih Hwang Ti.	
		Pharos, who goes to Philip.	219
219	Rome expels Demetrius of		
	Hannibal attacks Saguntum.	End of the war of the Leagues.	217
218	Declaration of (Second Punic) War, 218-201.	Ptolemy defeats Antiochus at Raphia.	
	Fall of Saguntum. Hannibal evades Scipio in Gaul, and crosses the Alps. Battle of Trebia.		
217	Scipios in Spain. Battle of Lake Trasimene.		
216	Q. Fabius Maximus made Dictator.		
	Death of Hiero of Syracuse.		
	Battle of Cannas; Hannibal occupies Capua.		
215	Treaty between Hannibal and Philip V.		
	Hannibal in S. Italy, Romans in Spain and Sicily.		
214	First Macedonian war.		
213	Scipios in Spain negotiate with Syphax of Numidia;	Antiochus recovers most of Asia Minor.	214
	Massinissa joins Carthaginians.	Death of Aratus.	213
212	Hannibal seizes Tarentum; Romans invest Capua.	China: Burning of the Books by Shih Hwang Ti.	
211	Young Scipio sent to Spain. Fall of Capua.		
	Macedonian war; Romans ally with Antiochians and		
210	Successes of Scipio, who takes New Carthage.	a Greek coalition against Philip and Achaeans.	211
	Egypt renews alliance	China: Death of Shih Hwang Ti.	210
209	Hasdrubal, brother of Hannibal, evades Scipio.		
208	Hasdrubal escapes into Gaul.	Eastern campaigns of Antiochus III	206-5
207	Hasdrubal crosses the Alps, but is crushed and killed by Claudius Nero at the Metaurus.	Philopoemen commands Achaean League.	208
		Philopoemen's victory at Mantinea.	207
		Antiochus recognizes Euthydemus of Bactria.	206
		China: Western Han Dynasty begins.	
205	Scipio in Sicily.	Accession of Ptolemy V Epiphanes, who is made a ward of the Roman People.	206
		Philip and Antiochus conspire against Ptolemy	
204	Scipio invades Africa; Massinissa joins him.		
203	Syphax overthrown by Scipio and Massinissa.		
	Hannibal recalled to Carthage.		
202	Slope of Carthage. Battle of Zama.		
201	Carthage submits to peace terms dictated by Scipio.		

## Chronicle VII

# THE BEGINNINGS OF ROMAN POWER: 280—202 B.C.

**T**HE central feature of the last chronicle was the revolution wrought by the brief but tremendous career of Alexander the Great; which shattered the old Asiatic power and carried Hellenism into the heart of Asia, but failed to create a new Hellenic power of equal magnitude in place of that which it destroyed, or to Europeanise the Orient. The central feature of the period now before us is the consolidation of a power in the West, emerging victoriously from a struggle that threatened its very existence, and prepared at last to effect the political conquest of both the Hellene and the Oriental, with neither of whom had it hitherto been brought into direct collision.

We shall, however, also see how Hellenic and Oriental disintegration was preparing the way for, and practically inviting, the coming Roman expansion; and incidentally we shall turn our attention to far eastern realms, to which Rome never penetrated and of which Alexander himself had touched only the fringe. For a long reign as ordinary human lives count, but for a brief span in the passing of the centuries, a vast Indian empire enjoyed perhaps the most enlightened rule known in the history of mankind, under the sway of Asoka—a prince whose very name never reached the West till he had been dead for more than two thousand years.

### Rome the dominant Power in Italy

**T**HE end of the Samnite wars left Rome incomparably the greatest power in Italy, but neither the north nor the south yet owned her as mistress. She had not yet actively intervened in the quarrels of Greeks and Italians in the south nor come into conflict with Sicily, where Agathocles at the age of seventy was contemplating a revival of the south Italian empire of Dionysius. But the death of Agathocles in 289, a year after the Samnite treaty, removed the practicability of Syracusan

intervention; the campaigns of 285-2 bridled the Gauls in the north; Samnites and Etruscans were in no mood for a renewal of the exhausting and unprofitable struggle; and the Lucanians, no longer useful to Rome as a check on the Samnites, were renewing their attacks on the Greek cities. Distrusting Tarentum, the most powerful and prosperous among them, the rest in 283 appealed for protection not to her but to Rome.

The Romans sent help promptly and effectively. The wiser heads in Tarentum saw no reason to object; but the popular party was furious, and began again to look eastwards for someone to fight their battles for them. The arrival at this moment of a small Roman squadron in forbidden waters was probably excusable as a war measure in defence of Greek allies; but it was a formal breach of the treaty of 302 B.C.; the populace of Tarentum lost its head, insulted the Roman mission of apology, made trouble among the other Greek cities, and prepared to avenge a nominal grievance by war.

### Adventures of King Pyrrhus in the West

**ONCE** again sudden help came to Tarentum from beyond the Adriatic. Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, was nephew and successor of that Alexander who had brought help before. He had also married a daughter of Agathocles, and seems to have regarded himself as his predestined successor, a part for which he was in many ways well suited. Sicily rather than Italy, which was to serve as a stepping-stone, was probably his real objective from the beginning. He had the reputation of a fire-brand among the 'Successor States,' whose kings seem to have sent him considerable forces (which they could now well spare), on the understanding that he did not employ them near home. Hence, for example, his elephant corps, a weapon new to the West, though the

Carthaginians were to use it before long. What Alexander had done in the Persian Empire, Pyrrhus evidently thought was possible also in the West, and Tarentum seemed the necessary base for such conquests.

This was not quite what the populace of Tarentum had intended, and the declaration of martial law by the advance guard which garrisoned their city in 280 B.C. cooled their love for Pyrrhus, who unlike previous adventurers had evidently come to stay. The other Greek cities had not asked for him, and the Romans had no intention of resigning her protectorate to a nominee of Tarentum.

Pyrrhus evidently had not heard much about the Romans; what he heard now evoked his respect; still more, what he saw, with a soldier's eye, in hard fighting





**SYRACUSAN IMPERIALIST**

An able soldier, Agathocles, tyrant of Syracuse, made himself king of Sicily and was establishing his power in southern Italy when he died in 289 B.C.

*National Museum, Naples*

at Heraclea and at Ausculum. Italian dominion was clearly not for him; he had come too late, and if Carthage was the enemy, as he had learned from Agathocles, there was nothing to be gained by quarrelling with Rome too. Carthage naturally thought otherwise, and sent a squadron up to the Tiber mouth to offer help against Pyrrhus. The terms of the 'third Treaty' now concluded between Rome and Carthage are instructive. If either state should ally itself with Pyrrhus against a third party (which could only be Greek) it was not only to reserve

its own neutrality if Pyrrhus should attack the other, but to bind itself to resist him, and in this event Carthage undertook to supply all naval transport. The effect was to limit Pyrrhus's career in the West to aggression against the Greek



**RECORDS OF THE FIRST ELEPHANT CORPS USED IN ITALIAN WARFARE**

In the army that Pyrrhus led against the Romans in 280 B.C. was a force of which the Italians had no experience whatsoever—war-elephants. One of these, bearing a howdah occupied by Greek soldiers, is represented in a contemporary South Italian platter (left). The legend that at Ausculum (279) the corps was stampeded by the grunting of swine is perpetuated by the Capuan bronze 'brick' in the British Museum (right) which has an elephant on the obverse, a sow on the reverse.

*Museo Villa Giulia, Rome (photo Alinari), and Hill, 'Historical Roman Coins'*

## Beginnings of Roman Power

states which he had nominally come to protect against either Rome or Carthage, or both ; for it prevented him from making use of either of the contracting parties against the other.

Old soldiers of Agathocles, settled now at Messana, offered their help too ; but Campania and most of the south gave Pyrrhus, at best, no encouragement. Only Etruria thought the tide had turned against Rome, and quickly discovered its mistake. After two campaigns, in which, though he always won battles, Pyrrhus was losing more men than he could afford, he moved on into Sicily (278), and the Romans had little difficulty in dealing with his friends and his rearguards.

The Carthaginians had not waited to be attacked. When Pyrrhus sailed for Sicily, they were besieging Syracuse, his necessary base, and looking for him with their fleet. He evaded their ships, however, and drove off their field army, captured Panormus and Eryx, and refused their offer to surrender everything in Sicily except Lilybaeum, which they really needed if they were to keep their hold on Sardinia. He seems to have hoped to reach Africa as Agathocles had done ; but his losses had been heavy, and reinforcements were few. Tarentum was hard pressed by the Romans, and between them and the Carthaginian fleet he might find himself interned in Sicily. So he returned into Italy, fought one more campaign with the Romans, lost it, because the Romans had learned meanwhile how to deal with his spearmen and his elephants, and so returned home, to die ingloriously three years later. His parting words were memorable : 'What a battlefield I am leaving for Carthage and Rome !'

In the year of his death (272 B.C.) Tarentum was surrendered to the Romans ; Greek cities and Bruttian tribes, with their

valuable forest-country, surrendered likewise, undertaking to supply Rome with ships and crews in future ; and the main lines of communication between Campania

and Magna Graecia were secured by Roman 'colonies.' In the north, where the last free Etruscan city, Volsinii, revolted and was destroyed in 264 B.C., similar precautions were taken ; so that all Italy now, from the Strait of Messina to the Apennine frontier towards the Gauls, became a single political whole, including indeed self-governed Greek colonies

'in alliance with the Roman people,' and Italian townships managing their own local affairs. But the whole was dominated by the 'Senate and People' of Rome, and garrisoned by substantial detachments of citizens domiciled in the great 'colonies' on the lands of those tribes which had given most trouble, or held the strongest natural positions. The place attained by Rome in the eyes of the world was attested by an embassy of amity in 273 from the Macedonian king of Egypt, Ptolemy Philadelphus ; the first recognition of the kind she had received.

**W**HILE things might have rested for a while, and the West might have had the chance of settling down, after a century and a half of disturbance following upon the defeat of the Athenian armada, if it had not been for the legacy of trouble which remained from the schemes of Agathocles. He, like Dionysius, had planned to weld Italian and Sicilian cities, Lucanians and Sicilians alike, into a Syracusan empire, and had made large use of free companies of highland irregulars from the mainland. Between Italy and Sicily there was, in any case, but a mile or two of water, and, on the Sicilian shore, Messana had fallen at Agathocles' death into the



### COINS OF A WEALTHY CITY

Tarentum, the prosperous Greek colony in Calabria which invited Pyrrhus into Italy, surrendered to Rome in 272 B.C. Above, two of its stateres minted during the Pyrrhic war.

From John Ward, 'Greek Coins' (Murray)



## Beginnings of Roman Power

hands of one of these free companies—the Mamertini or 'Sons of Mars'—who made themselves a nuisance to their neighbours on both coasts, and to all who used the straits, that is to say, to Greek traders from all parts.

They had recently been in league with a company of their Campanian countrymen, who, being in the Roman service, had mutinied, seized Rhegium, and held it against the Romans for ten years. The revolt had been suppressed in 270 by the aid of the commander of the Syracusan forces, who bore the historic name of Hieron (or Hiero as the Romans called him), and immediately afterwards had made himself master and 'king' of Syracuse (270-216); much as Agathocles and Dionysius had done, but with a more modest programme.

In 265 B.C. Hiero thought it time to make an end of the Mamertine pirates; and, so far as their own merits went, no one was likely to be aggrieved. But if he did, what was to happen to Messana and who had something to gain by using the Mamertines to obtain a footing there, or to prevent Hiero from gaining one? The Mamertines were not Greeks, and could make themselves very useful to Carthage, the traditional enemy of all things Greek. On the other hand, they were of Italian origin, and Rome now stood as the conscious and very efficient protector of all Italian interests. The Mamertines offered themselves and their Sicilian city to the Romans; and thereby brought Rome itself to the cross-roads of destiny.

### Rome's Decision at the Cross-roads

**3**<sup>r</sup> the Romans helped the Mamertines, who were (as we have seen) evil breakers of the peace, they must offend Hiero, their friend and well wisher, and their own Greek allies, who had suffered worst from Mamertine ravages. They would probably also offend Carthage, and Carthage could put much trouble in their way. The Mamertines, while they were of Italian origin, were being threatened by the city which had shown most capacity for managing Greek interests on a large scale. If Rome refused help, would not Carthage herself step in? And what were the prospects of legitimate Italian trade,

with Carthage in control of the Strait? Left to itself, the Senate might have abandoned the Mamertines to their fate, and Carthage, evidently expecting this, and encouraged by another faction in Messana, sent the required help. This settled the matter; popular clamour and business interests combined to force the Senate's hand. An advance force was sent to Messana, made touch with the partisans of Rome in the city, and ejected the Carthaginians, whose government, with characteristic abruptness, executed their own general, made alliance with Syracuse, reconciled Hiero with the Mamertines, and sent over a fresh force to support both against the Romans. By the end of the year, however, they had been expelled from the neighbourhood of Messana, and Hiero was shut up in Syracuse.

But the main issue was now clear: whether Rome or Carthage was to guide the fortunes of Sicily. Hiero saw this clearly, and for the representative of Greek interests there was but one course of action possible. For nearly five hundred years Greek and Phoenician had worked and plotted and fought for this central region of the West. To co-operate with Carthage now, against the new power which had delivered the Greeks of Italy



### OPPOSING FORCES IN SICILY

Hiero II, king of Syracuse, who worked for the independence of Greek Sicily, and his wife Philistis are portrayed on the upper two coins. The lower (both sides shown) was struck by his foes, the Mamertine freebooters of Messana.

From G. F. Hill, 'Select Greek Coins,' G. Van Oort, Paris



from Etruscan, Samnite and Lucanian, repelled the Gauls and wrecked the designs of Pyrrhus for an Empire of Epirus, would be folly and treason unimaginable. Under Roman protectorate, Syracuse and all western Greeks would be safe; with Greek subsidies, ships and crews Rome could be trusted to win; and Roman victory meant the expulsion of Phoenicians from Sicily. Hiero accordingly offered the Romans the possession of Messina and a subsidy of one hundred talents annually for fifteen years if they would guarantee his 'kingship' of Syracuse. It was a small price to pay for security unattainable otherwise; and for the Romans, too, the bargain was a good one (263).

The 'First Punic War,' accidentally begun but directed to a clear issue by the statesmanship of Hiero, lasted twenty years, and ended with the total defeat of Carthage. But it was a hard struggle, and the result was long doubtful.

#### Events of the First Punic War

**I**N the first three years (264-261 B.C.) the Romans captured the great fortress of Agrigento, which they called Agrigentum, still the next city of Sicily after Syracuse, and confined the Carthaginian forces to the rugged western districts around their own ports. But by resigning territory Carthage simplified the problems of defence on land, and was able to raid not only the Greek coast cities, but also the long Roman lines of communication, which were mostly within reach of the sea. For this state of things there was but one remedy: 'a sea power, with its arsenal overseas, can only be vanquished on the sea, and by superior sea power.'

If Rome was to win, Rome must have a fleet; and in the second stage of the war (260-253) not only was this accomplished, with liberal help from Greek 'naval allies' organized on a grand scale, but in spite of early defeats, and other disasters due to Roman inexperience, the traditional seamanship of the Carthaginians was foiled by mechanical devices for bringing their ships to a standstill, and so 'fighting a land battle on the water.' In 256 the destruction of the Carthaginian 'grand fleet' off Heraclea on the south coast of Sicily

by a Roman squadron, encumbered though it was with a convoy of transports, laid open the way to Africa. Here the natives rose against their masters, as they had risen for Agathocles, and the Roman force advanced within sight of Carthage. At this point peace might have been made; but the Roman commander, Regulus, demanded too much; the Carthaginians found in the Lacedaemonian adventurer Xanthippus a soldier of genius to reorganize and lead their forces; Regulus was defeated and captured, and the survivors of his army were wrecked on their homeward journey. The Roman 'blow at the heart' had failed (255).

Carthage, however, had suffered severely in prestige as well as equipment, and might have suffered worse had not the next year's Roman fleet been wrecked on its way to Africa (253), with the result that for a while only coast defence squadrons were in commission, and Roman commanders concentrated their resources on the reduction of enemy fortresses in Sicily. By 250 B.C. only Lilybaeum and a new naval base at Drepanum remained untaken, and it became clear once more that these remote ports might hold out indefinitely, if the Romans could not blockade them also by sea. Again Carthage tried to compromise, but her overtures were flatly rejected.

#### The Romantic Story of Regulus

**T**HE established Roman tradition affirms that the rejection was due to the action of the captive consul Regulus, and the story, whether true or not, has set him among the heroic figures of the world. For five years he had been held a prisoner by the Carthaginians. Now they sent him with their embassy to Rome, under parole; never doubting that all his powerful influence would be exerted in favour of the peace which would restore him to liberty. Nevertheless, so runs the tale, with no illusions as to the cruel fate which awaited him, he set aside all thought of self, bade the Romans to take no thought of him, and urged them to refuse the offered terms. He might easily have broken his parole and remained at Rome a free man, but his high sense of honour

forbade him to do so, and he returned to Carthage with the disappointed and angry ambassadors, there to suffer a barbarous death at the hands of his vindictive captors. But at Rome the memory of him was cherished and revered, as the supreme exemplar of the qualities *Pietas* and *Gravitas*, to which above all else Rome loved to think that she owed her greatness.

So Rome resolved to see the war to a satisfactory end and began building ships again, and training admirals in the rude school of naval disasters. At this stage it was a serious disappointment that in renewing their treaty with Hiero in 248 B.C. they had to forgo the Syracusan tribute. Sicily was, indeed, well nigh ruined by the long war, and in particular by the cost of great sieges at the distant west end. Henceforward the cost of these operations and of the renewal of their fleets fell principally on the Romans themselves, while any trade they had had was paralysed by Carthaginian cruisers, which ranged as far north as the home district of Latium.

A fourth stage of the war opens in 247 B.C. with the appearance of a Carthaginian commander, Hamilcar Barca, worthy of the honourably descriptive name (*Barca*, or *Barak*, means 'lightning') that he bore. By vigorous privateering—for Carthage, too, was running short of state-owned ships—and by establishing fresh raiding ports at Ercte and Eryx, whence he could devastate the Romans' communications with their own siege works, he prolonged the desperate resistance of the blockaded fortresses, and all but exhausted the resources and the determination of the besiegers.

Carthage brought to her knees

**F**INALLY, in 242 B.C., the perilous experiment of naval action was adopted once more by the Senate. The new fleet was built with private subscriptions, but it was well found, and at last efficiently handled. Its sole commission was to cut off

supplies from the Sicilian fortresses, and in this it not only succeeded, but had the good luck to intercept and destroy the last ill escorted convoy that Carthage was able to send. The Carthaginian government could do no more; there were native revolts in Africa; and mercenaries will not fight long without pay. Hamilcar was prepared to persist, but was induced at last to conduct the negotiations himself.

The Roman terms were severe: Carthage was to evacuate Sicily and surrender it to Rome, with all adjacent islands; to restore prisoners and deserters; to pay an immense indemnity spread over ten years; and to promise not to make war

in future on Hiero or his allies. Hiero's territory was enlarged, and his independence as an ally of Rome guaranteed. Messina and a few other cities were received likewise into 'free' and equal alliance; but the rest of Sicily remained in Roman hands as conquered territory, administered by a resident governor and chief justice, sent annually from Rome, and paying to Rome a tithe on all produce, and harbour dues on all imports and exports (241).

This was a fresh departure in Roman foreign policy, due partly to the circumstances of annexation after ruinous war, partly to an unfortunate imitation of Carthaginian methods. For in Italy all districts which were not either the territory of a 'free and allied' city and consequently self-governed, or depopulated and therefore assignable as war booty to Roman citizens or for public use as grazing grounds, had been retained by their original inhabitants, under separate treaty in each district, and on the understanding that those inhabitants should help Rome in time of need, and meanwhile enjoy some or all of the civil rights of the Romans themselves. The more favoured peoples were even admitted to Roman citizenship; they were qualified, that is, to serve in the legionary army, even if they



**WALLED ERYX**

The ramparts of Eryx, where Hamilcar established himself in 244 B.C., and its temple are represented in this coin.

*British Museum*

had neither desire nor facilities for exercising their political franchise in one of the numerous 'rural tribes' which were added to the voting list from time to time. The best reason for the new distinction between 'Italians' and 'provincials' was that the civilization of the Sicilians was fundamentally Greek; their laws, customs, and beliefs were Greek. It seemed, therefore, to be the more considerate course to leave them in enjoyment of the culture and rights that they had, with only a Roman appeal court to see that local customs were observed, and so prevent private grievances from breeding political discontent, and with a Roman commissioner to organize local resistance in case of attack, until the home government could intervene.

But it was one thing to make local taxation balance the expenses of administration, and quite another to impose a permanent tribute for the use of the 'Senate and People of Rome,' even if for the immediate future it might be fair to supplement the huge Carthaginian indemnity by a subsidy, to restore Rome itself to solvency. Worse still, the mismanagement of the 'public lands' (confiscated as already described from the more obstinate of the conquered peoples), which had long been a public scandal in Italy, was greatly aggravated when it occurred on the very large scale, which seems to have been allowed in Sicily, and with only the quite inadequate supervision of an annually appointed governor, without opportunity for inspection, or even experience of the system. And the reckless and oppressive exploitation which the Carthaginians seem to have practised in all their dominions set a disastrous example to the Roman speculators and absentee landlords, who alone had the private wealth to undertake the management of what were nominally 'estates of the Roman People.'

#### Aftermath of the Exhausting Struggle

**F**OR Rome had suffered heavily in the war, Carthage was almost ruined; and the peace brought worse disasters still. First, the vast mercenary forces which had been levied, but not yet transported

to Sicily, mutinied for arrears of pay; and for three years the Carthaginians carried their lives in their hands, while the 'truceless war' raged till Hamilcar's strategy and personal influence out-matched the blunders of the government and the blind fury of the rebels, and exterminated the survivors of the army he had hoped to command. Though Rome refused to take advantage of this African mutiny, it was another matter when Hamilcar was at last able to set sail for Sardinia to deal with a similar rebellion there. This the Roman Senate chose to regard as a breach of the peace treaty, and by way of compensation extorted not only an additional indemnity, but the surrender of Sardinia itself, and Corsica also. Probably the mere knowledge that Hamilcar was at sea at all bred panic, and cruel injustice; but whatever the motive, the possession of these imperfectly civilized islands gave Rome frequent anxiety thereafter; and, worst of all, provoked Hamilcar to the vast project of reprisals in Spain, which occupied the remainder of his life. Sardinia, in due course, became a Roman 'province' on the same model as Sicily; Corsica merely derelict territory at the disposal of the Senate and any Roman speculator who cared to venture thither for timber or minerals.

#### Causes and Effects of the War

**T**HE First Punic War was probably inevitable. It was the outcome of centuries of well matched rivalry between Greek and Phœnician on Sicilian soil, and of the complications overseas, as far distant as Etruria, Corsica and Epirus, which that rivalry provoked. Now, after almost as long a preparation, the quite separate feud between highland and lowland peoples in Italy had been settled wholly in favour of the latter; and the lowland interests of Italy, with the sole exception of Etruria, were intimately connected with those of the Greek cities on the coasts. In the course of that struggle for supremacy in Italy the other question, whether Etruria was to retain its early mastery, had been settled in Campania by the Samnite invasion, and

## Beginnings of Roman Power

farther north by Rome and its Latin allies. Finally the blunders of Tarentum and its Spartan and Epirote helpers had convinced all Greek cities in turn, from Cumae to Syracuse, that the West fared best when it looked after itself; that their sole alternative to hereditary feuds and divided counsels was general but separate agreement to co-operate with Rome. Historically, Sicily had been unified with Magna Graecia, and Magna Graecia with Campania, by the Greek colonisation of all three; and, in view of the past, Greek Sicily could not feel itself safe as long as Carthage held even one defensible port on its coast. And if Greek freedom of intercourse with Phocaean Massalia (called by the Romans Massilia, modern Marseilles) was to be assured, Corsica, at least, and even Sardinia, must be in friendly control; for Massalia too had had its own troubles with Carthage, and in due course became a 'free and equal ally of the Roman People,' like its sister cities in South Italy.

Africa, on the other hand, and western Libya were a separate affair. Between Greek Cyrene and the Phoenician Tripolis there was no-man's-land enough behind the Quicksands; west of Sicily there had never been Greek colonies; and the old Phocaean connexion with Tartessus seems to have lapsed early. Daughter cities of Massalia, indeed, existed as far afield as Tarraco near the mouth of the Ebro; and Roman politicians argued from the look of its name that Saguntum (in the rich coast plain of Valencia) had been once a colony from Greek Zacynthus. But with these exceptions Spain, like Africa, was unexplored by Greeks, and there is little reason to believe that even Phoenicians had seriously tapped the wealth of the land, except around Gades (Cadiz).

### Two Courses open to Carthage

THE Carthaginians, therefore, had not lost everything, though they had been driven out of waters where they necessarily collided with Greeks, and increasingly with Italian traders also, as their commercial treaties with the Romans show. There were two distinct careers still open to them: their original exploitation of Africa, both the mountainous north

and the oases and caravan routes towards the Niger basin, in the first place; and the development of trade in the farther west of the Mediterranean, above described. Conservative managers were prepared to be content with Africa, relying on mutually advantageous trade with their late enemies, to make good their losses of oversea territory. Hamilcar Barca on the other hand was for the bolder plan of forestalling Greek and Roman alike in Spain, while that was still possible; like Canning, but in a more literal sense, he would 'call a new world into existence to redress the balance of the old.' It was in the long run the inability of Carthage to choose definitely between these two policies, and also to keep family feuds out of public life, that forfeited the fruits of both.

### A New Carthage founded in Spain

THE 'new world' of Spain, to which Hamilcar now (238) turned, with the sceptical and lukewarm concurrence of the home government, was a continent rather than a country. Around its great central plateau lie to the north-west the distant, rugged, barbarous, but metal-yielding highlands, to the north-east the wide trough of the Iberus (Ebro) valley, which gives its ancient name to the whole 'Iberian' peninsula. South-east, a continuation of the Atlas range curves round from the Strait, parallel with the Mediterranean coast, and sinks seaward to form the chain of the Balearic islands; like the north-west, this highland is very rich in copper and other ores. Behind this, and between it and the south edge of the plateau, lies the Guadalquivir basin, like another Ebro, and of almost tropical fertility. Beyond, the range which reaches the sea at Cape St. Vincent is another mining district, and then come the coastal plains of Portugal, intersected by the great rivers which drain the central plateau. Smaller frontage plains, on the Mediterranean littoral, extend some way both north and south from Cape Nao opposite the Balearic islands.

Whereas former explorers, both Phoenician and Greek, had made Gades and the Tartessian country, beyond the

Strait, their headquarters, Hamilcar's wider designs required a more accessible and also a more defensible base. This he found in a detached spur of the south-eastern range, midway in the more southerly of the frontage plains already noted. At its seaward end it is the south horn of a deep bay, which has caused a long bar of shingle to form across its mouth and enclose a lagoon, while river-silt has accumulated landward, in a very fertile plain. The situation is in essentials a duplicate of Carthage itself (see page 1615): defensible promontory, safe harbour, flanking lagoon, adjacent garden ground, with arable and pasture beyond and good valley routes through the mountains towards the plateau and the headwaters of the Guadalquivir.


Here then 'New Carthage' was set out; and modern Cartagena preserves its name. How it flourished, and what success Hamilcar had in conciliating native peoples and exploiting natural wealth, is evident from the treaty which was drafted

after Hamilcar's death in 228 B.C. between his son-in-law Hasdrubal and the Romans, by which the Ebro river was to be recognized as defining the spheres of influence of Rome and Carthage respectively. As Rome, though busy enough since the First Punic War along her northern frontiers, had no footing yet beyond the Apennines, this Ebro frontier clearly represented only the reasonable claims of Massalia and other old Phocaean settlements. But it illustrates the indifference with which responsible people in Carthage regarded Hamilcar's doings, that this agreement seems to have been neither rejected nor ratified; and certainly the Romans made no secret, a few years later, of their alliance with Saguntum, which lay nearly a hundred miles south of the Ebro, and moreover was the key to the rich coast plain of Valencia. The date of this alliance is unknown, but whether it was earlier or later than Hasdrubal's agreement, the distinction between Roman dominion and Roman alliance was quite



#### ROMAN REMAINS IN A SPANISH TOWN THAT WAS ONCE INDEPENDENT

The indifference of Carthage with regard to Spain in the decade following Hamilcar's death is illustrated by the fact that Saguntum could openly ally itself with Rome, although in the Carthaginian sphere of influence according to the treaty made in 228 B.C. A native Spanish city (erroneously believed by the Romans to have been a Greek colony), Saguntum was a wealthy commercial centre; it later became a Roman colony, when the theatre whose ruins are shown above was built.



#### MILITARY HIGHWAY BUILT TO SECURE ROME'S NORTHERN MARCHES

To make his victories over the Gauls in Italy permanent, the censor Gaius Flaminius had the old military road that connected Rome with Spolegium extended to Ariminum (see map in page 1574). Named the Flaminian Road after him, it now ran across the main ridge of the Apennines to Cales, and thereafter followed the pass of Intercisa (modern Furlo), where it is seen above. At Forum Fortunae it touched the Adriatic coast, which it skirted until Ariminum was reached.


*Photo, Allinari*

well recognized; for example in the Carthaginian treaty of 348 B.C.

**I**N eight years more, by 220 B.C., all the native peoples up to the Ebro line had been brought into formal subjection to Carthage; only Saguntum remained not only independent but positively allied with Rome. Hasdrubal was dead (he had been assassinated in 221), and it was on his successor Hannibal that the responsibility lay for what followed. Hannibal was the son of Hamilcar Barca; he had been consecrated from boyhood to avenge his father's expulsion from Sicily, and was a man of amazing energy and resource, one of the great personal leaders of all time. Wise heads in Carthage had done what they could to prevent his succession to the Spanish viceroyalty; but his father's army worshipped him, and would have no other; so the government accepted him. The Spanish venture had been throughout a personal enterprise of his family; there was no obligation to support him, and in case of trouble he could be disowned. It seems certain that Carthage itself did not want another war with Rome.

Nor did the Romans want it. Since the treaty with Hasdrubal they had been forced to undertake heavy work by a fresh raid of Gauls from beyond the Alps; they had been obliged to occupy Gaulish territory as far as the Po, to found colonies at Placentia and Cremona, for the defence of the passage of this river, and to raid beyond it as far as Mediolanum (Milan). The great Flaminian Road had just been carried forward to the Adriatic coast to ensure communication with their new conquests. They had had little wars in Liguria and also in Istria, and in 221 B.C. their whole field force was in Illyria across the Adriatic, destroying the league of pirates which had been harrying the east coast of Italy.

The significance of the Illyrian affair is not to be overlooked. Piracy had long been rife in the Adriatic, with which until recently Rome had scarcely been concerned; but the Punic war had left her mistress of its Italian shore as Dionysius of Syracuse had once been for a short time; and her orderly instincts gave her a corresponding sense of responsibility. In suppressing the Illyrian buccaneering power, she appeared as the protector



# THE STATES OF THE EAST AFTER THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE EMPIRE FOUNDED BY ALEXANDER THE GREAT

Three kingdoms ruled by dynasties established by Macedonian generals emerged from the wreck of Alexander's empire. Under the Ptolemies Egypt entered upon a period of renewed prosperity; the Seleucid kings of Syria secured a part of the Asiatic territories conquered by Alexander; and Macedonia was ruled by the descendants of Antigonus. Parthia, however, revolved from the Syrian kingdom, and eventually became a powerful independent empire; India quickly recovered from the Macedonian conquest, and prospered under a line of great emperors, including the saintly Asoka. In China Shih Hwang Ti made himself supreme, and welded the feudal provinces into a centralised empire. These conditions endured until Rome's invasion of Asia.

## Beginnings of Roman Power

primarily of Greek commerce, a champion of Hellenic interests against the barbarian ; and by so doing she was preparing the states of Greece to turn to her as protector against Macedon.

All these operations tended to consolidate the Roman power in Italy ; if the Roman domination restricted political liberties, it at least gave as compensation an unwonted security. But for Rome they had been costly and exhausting ; and the last thing she desired was to be forced into a war likely to prove still more costly and still more exhausting, of which the issue would be extremely doubtful.

Accordingly, when the news reached Rome that Hannibal was attacking Saguntum, the Romans sent him only a formal protest ; and when this was ignored, took up the affair with the responsible government of Carthage. Here opinion was divided : one party wished to surrender Hannibal and compensate Rome, but Hannibal's friends prevailed. They appealed to the treaty of 228 B.C.—which had not been ratified—and laid the blame for the collision on Saguntum, thus gaining time till Hannibal had destroyed it. Then, when Roman envoys arrived again, they tried too late to repudiate the draft treaty, and all responsibility for Hannibal's acts : did the Romans wish to pick a quarrel or not ? 'Peace or war, as you shall choose,' was the reply ; and as peace was broken, war it was—the 'Hannibalic war' of the next seventeen years.

### The World East of the Adriatic

THE critical struggle in the West (218-202) involved the first entanglement of Macedonian affairs with those of Rome ; so that before proceeding to the story of the Second Punic War, we must follow the developments that had been taking place in the world lying east of the Adriatic Sea since Pyrrhus planned his great adventure in the west in 280.

In that year Ptolemy Ceraunus stabbed his benefactor Seleucus in the back while engaged in a religious ceremony, and was somewhat incomprehensibly hailed as king by the army. Lysimachus and Ptolemy were dead ; the son of the latter, Antigonus Gonatas, and the son

of Seleucus, Antiochus I of Syria, were not immediately ready to challenge the assassin and usurper. His career, however, was cut short by a new and unlooked-for enemy. He was slain in the same year, in battle with the Gauls.

There is no earlier record of a recognizable Celtic incursion in the east. When the first Celtic tide flowed westwards, it had not struck the lower waters of the Danube. But now in the early third century B.C., swarms of Gauls—whether they were a back-flow, as seems more probable, or a belated horde—flooded into Thrace. The crown was hardly on Ptolemy's head when he had to march against them, to his own doom. In 279 they poured down through Thessaly into Phocis ; but at Delphi the god—so runs the legend—guarded his own against the sacrilegious barbarian with earthquakes and portents ; and the demoralised Gauls were put to utter rout by the hastily gathered levies of the Greek cities (see page 1527). They rolled back into Thrace, where for some time to come they remained in possession.

### Dynasties of the Diadochi

IN the turmoil which followed the death of Ceraunus, Antigonus Gonatas won the Macedonian crown, but had to fight hard for it. For Pyrrhus on his return from the west advanced a rival claim ; the cities of Greece were tumbled into the fray ; and it was only brought to an ignominious end when Pyrrhus was killed by a tile, flung by a woman's hand from a house-top, as he was fighting his way through the streets of Argos (272).

Pyrrhus left no efficient successor. As a soldier, Hannibal rated him as second only to Alexander ; but, being a soldier for the love of soldiering, and nothing more, he achieved a magnificent reputation, and accomplished nothing at all.

Just over half a century, then, after the death of Alexander, the dynasties of three of his generals were established in three parts of the vast dominion of which he had made himself lord. The grandson of Antigonus ruled in Europe, the son of Seleucus in Asia, the son of Ptolemy in Egypt. But in Europe Thrace was no longer a part of the Macedonian kingdom ;



in Asia the effective Seleucid dominion or empire corresponded in extent to the old Assyrian empire, with Media and Persia—all that lay to the east of that had gone or was on the point of going. As in the ancient days, Egypt disputed the sovereignty in a great part of Syria; and, again as in the ancient days, most of what lay west and north of the Taurus barrier was broken up into independent and ill-defined kingdoms, or states whose rulers had not yet assumed the royal title.

Antigonus Gonatas was secured in Macedon by the fall of his brilliant and dangerous rival, in 272. Theoretically, the states of Greece were still independent; but the old states were as incapable as ever of effective combination, and individually there was not now any one of them strong enough to impose active co-operation on others, or by itself to challenge the supremacy, which in actual fact meant the dictation, of the king of Macedon. The support given to Pyrrhus by several Peloponnesian cities and by Athens now afforded Gonatas an excuse for reducing them to subjection, and establishing in most of them tyrants who were at his service.

#### The Achaean and Aetolian Leagues

**W**ITHIN the next few years, however, two leagues were coming into prominence, the Achaean and the Aetolian. Achaean is that strip of the Peloponnese which lies on the shore of the Gulf of Corinth. Hitherto it had played no conspicuous part in history. The league in which its cities had united themselves practically formed a neutral state amid the general commotions. But it had felt the heavy hand of Antigonus, and in 251 it was joined by Sicyon under the guidance of Aratus, who had effected the expulsion of the tyrants who ruled there by favour of Macedon. Aratus at once became the moving spirit of the Achaean League, which within a few years was joined by city after city within and

without the Peloponnese, Sparta as usual holding aloof.

The Aetolian League was a long-standing confederation of the politically undeveloped highland tribes in the west, on the north side of the Corinthian Gulf. In the past, Aetolia had stood clear of Greek political complications, though the Athenian general Demosthenes had tried—and failed—to make it a base for attacking Boeotia. Latterly, however, it had been absorbing wider territories, and after the death of Gonatas in 239 the Aetolians were even bringing parts of the Peloponnese under their sway. (For a fuller discussion of these two leagues see Chap. 57).

Antigonus Gonatas was succeeded by his son Demetrius II, who died in 229, leaving an heir (afterwards Philip V), who was as yet too young to succeed. For nine years the throne was occupied by his cousin and guardian Antigonus Doson, on whose death in 220 Philip, being then only seventeen, became king, Antigonus having regarded himself as regent on behalf of the boy.

In the last years of Gonatas a pathetic attempt was made by the young Spartan king Agis IV to revive the old heroic ideals of Sparta, which cost him his life. His chief opponent was the other king, Leonidas; and, curiously enough, it was on Cleomenes, son of Leonidas, that the mantle of Agis fell. The result appeared in a revival of military vigour while Demetrius and Antigonus Doson (Antigonus the 'Man of Promises') were reigning in Macedon. But a Spartan recovery meant collision with the new Pelopon-



AN ARMED GAUL

This Roman badge of pewter represents a Gaulish warrior of the period of the Celtic invasions of Thrace.

*British Museum*

nesian power, the Achaean League (227-221); Aratus was compelled to invite the intervention of Antigonus; and the rising Spartan power was shattered at the battle of Sellasia. The death of Antigonus next year (220) made young Philip king of Macedon—just when Rome was completing her operations against the troublesome pirates of the Illyrian coast.



#### FORTRESS THAT DOMINATED THE WEALTHY CITY OF PERGAMUM

The citadel of Pergamum was renowned as an inviolate stronghold in the Hellenistic age, and here Lysimachus, king of Thrace and later of Macedon also, kept his treasures. They were entrusted to the care of Philetaerus, a eunuch in his service, who appropriated them when he revolted to Seleucus. On the death of this monarch he declared himself independent, and by his political genius laid securely the foundations of the Pergamene kingdom that he bequeathed to his nephew Eumenes.

*From 'Altertümer von Pergamum IV'*

The blow to Sparta, however, encouraged the Aetolians to develop their aggressive activities in the Peloponnese and brought them into direct conflict with the Achaean League, which again appealed to Macedon. Philip sent aid, but deserted Aratus in 217. For Hannibal was in Italy and Demetrius of Pharos, one of the pirate chiefs, appealed for aid against Rome. Philip's eyes were turned to the West, and from this time Greek affairs are intertwined with the story of Rome. Philip made alliance with Hannibal; as he was the friend of the Achaeans, the Aetolians sought and obtained alliance with Rome; but both to Rome and to Macedon, though both intervened, the affairs of Greece were a secondary matter. The conflict was in 205 closed for the time by a decisive victory won over the Aetolians and Lacedaemonians by the great Arcadian captain of the Achaean League, Philopoemen (c. 243-183), at Mantinea.

When Seleucus was murdered by Ptolemy Ceraunus he had actually become lord of all that had once been the Persian empire except Egypt and the Indian satrapy, with the addition of

Alexander's farthest eastern conquest, Sogdiana; but in Asia Minor his authority was merely nominal. In the sixty years following his death, his successors, Antiochus I (280-261), Antiochus II Theos (261-246), Seleucus II (246-226) and Seleucus III (226-223), were wholly ousted from Asia Minor, lost all the territories east of Persis proper and Media, where new powers were rising, and lost to Egypt Phoenicia and a substantial part of Syria, though the Syrian or Seleucid power revived under Antiochus III, called 'the Great' (223-187).

In Asia Minor the native kingdoms of Cappadocia, Pontus and Bithynia were already established. Philetaerus and his nephew Eumenes were founding a principality of their own at Pergamum. In 277 the Gauls from Thrace, first coming at the invitation of Nicomedes of Bithynia, poured into the country, and though Antiochus inflicted a severe defeat on them, he could not prevent them from conquering a great area in the centre, where their confederacy became known as Galatia. The Gallic menace was not in fact quelled till Attalus I of Pergamum (241-197), the successor of Eumenes, refused to pay the



#### FOUNDER OF A DYNASTY

Philaetelus, the first ruler of Pergamum, achieved his position by skilful political intrigue, having originally governed that city for Lysimachus of Thrace. He is here represented on a Pergamene tetradrachm, with Athena on the reverse.

*From John Ward, 'Greek Coins' (Murray)*

accustomed blackmail demanded by the brigand power, and by a decisive victory delivered the neighbouring lands from their aggressions—incidentally winning thereby grateful recognition as King of Pergamum, and a large accession of territory.

The reigns of Antiochus I and II were much occupied with a series of 'Syrian' wars with Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-246), the effect of which was to place most of the south coast of Asia Minor as well as Phoenicia in Ptolemy's control. Antiochus II was still reigning when, in 250, Diodotus the governor of Bactria declared his independence (see page 1490), and two nomad chiefs, Arsaces and Tiridates, ejected the governor of Parthia and founded the Arsacid Dynasty of what was to be ere long the Parthian empire.

Selencus II, who almost throughout his twenty years' reign was at war with his brother Antiochus Hierax, failed to recover what had already been lost, and lost more of Asia Minor to Attalus. During this reign, Ptolemy III Euergetes (247-222), a celebrated patron of literature and the arts, as his father had also been, carried conquering arms as far as Susa and bore back to Egypt vast spoils, but did not seek to retain his fresh acquisitions. A year after the accession of Antiochus III, Ptolemy IV Philopator (222-205) succeeded Euergetes in Egypt.

The young king of northern Syria—for at the beginning of his reign Antiochus was hardly more—showed energy and capacity. He crushed a revolt in Media and Persis, and recovered Phoenicia;

but when he attempted a direct attack on Egypt he met with a crushing defeat at Raphia (217) which compelled him to relinquish this conquest, though Ptolemy made no further use of the victory. But in the course of the next few years Antiochus carried his arms into Parthia, where Arsaces III was forced to acknowledge his suzerainty, and into Bactria, where Euthydemus, the successor of Diodotus, only saved his independence by threatening to call in the Scythians, which would have meant the disappearance of that Hellenism of which the house of Seleucus boasted itself to be traditional champion. Before the Bactrian expedition, he had recovered lost provinces in Asia Minor from Pergamum. Thus when the Punic war in the west was drawing to its close, Antiochus 'the Great' was the most powerful potentate east of the Adriatic and west of the Hindu Kush.

#### Developments in the Farther East

**I**N India, however, the great Maurya empire, founded by Chandragupta, had in the meantime been glorified by the



#### AN ABLE AND SUCCESSFUL DESPOT

After crushing the Gauls in Asia Minor, Attalus I of Pergamum (who is almost certainly portrayed in this bust) took the title of king. A capable ruler, he enlarged his dominions, and encouraged learning and the arts.

*Berlin Museum; from Delbrück, 'Antike Porträts'*

## Beginnings of Roman Power

reign of Asoka; and far away in unknown China important events were happening.

China was in effect a vast empire of the order commonly called feudal; that is, the whole was an aggregation of principalities or baronies, large and small, which professed allegiance to one emperor whose actual authority was of the slightest. Since about the twelfth century B.C. the Chou dynasty had been reigning. But while common institutions prevailed, there was no effective central control; princes and barons ruled as seemed good to them according to their power in their own provinces; the defence of the empire against the incursions of the central Asian nomad hordes was left to the barons of the marches. Towards the middle of the third century a group of confederate barons headed by the prince of T'sin, on the western march, overturned the Chous without setting up a new emperor. The obvious necessity, however, was the establishment of a central authority; and in 220 the young and exceedingly vigorous prince who had recently succeeded in T'sin, the most powerful of the principalities, boldly declared himself sole emperor by the name of Shih Hwang Ti and proceeded to make good his position.

In the ten years of his reign (220-210) he built the Great Wall of China, a solid rampart 1,200 miles in length, against the nomads, from T'sin in the west to the



### BRILLIANT RULERS OF HELLENIC EGYPT

Ptolemy II Philadelphus (left) and Ptolemy III Euergetes (right) both increased the wealth and power of Egypt; and by their assiduous patronage of learning made Alexandria the greatest contemporary centre of Greek culture. Ptolemy II married his sister—the famous Arsinoë (middle).

From Delbruck, 'Antike Porträts,' and John Ward, 'Greek Coins'

north-eastern sea—the labour involved must have been terrific—and he deliberately destroyed nearly all the books and records, in particular the works of Confucius, to which Chinese conservatism could appeal in support of the system which he was engaged in obliterating. The books which were not burned in the holocaust were saved and secreted at the peril of the lives of their saviours, of whom some five hundred were actually buried alive; while thousands, probably, were sent to labour on the building of the Wall. While Shih Hwang Ti reigned, there was no doubt about the power of the central authority. He did not live long enough to found a dynasty; but that was done a few years after his death by a soldier of peasant origin, known to history as Kao-ti or Kao-Tsu (206-193), the first ruler of the great dynasty of Han (see Chap. 75).



### FIRST KING OF PARTHIA

Arsaces, having headed a successful revolt of the Parthians against Antiochus II of Syria (250 B.C.), founded the Parthian Kingdom. He is depicted on the obverse (left) of this tetradrachm struck a century later by Mithradates I.

British Museum

In India Chandragupta had so extended the Magadha dominion that when he abdicated in 298 he was recognized sovereign from Herat to the Narbada and the Ganges Delta. When his son and successor, Bindusara, died, after a reign of twenty-five years, in 273, the empire had been carried across the Narbada and embraced a great part of the Deccan or what is now the Nizam's Dominion. There was, apparently, some dispute over the succession, for the accession of his son, Asoka, to the throne, was in 269.

After the normal manner of Indian princes, Asoka started on a career of

conquest, and subjugated Kalinga, the eastern territory lying between the rivers Mahanadi and Godavari. He conquered no more; and it was not that he lacked either the means or the ability, but simply because his campaigning experience made the miseries and iniquities of war utterly detestable to him. He had undergone conversion. What is fundamental in the story, if it can be called a story, of his reign, which ended in 232, we know from his own 'pillar edicts' and 'rock edicts,' which constitute an autobiography; the later fictions of Buddhist monks may be ignored. Conversion with him meant that he embraced the doctrines of Buddhism with conviction, and on the moral side not only practised them himself but required his ministers to make them the basis of their administration.

His vast realm was governed on the principles of an intelligent humani-

tarianism, which relied upon moral force but was under no illusions as to the need for efficient physical force behind it. Significantly, his subjects are bidden to turn from evil ways 'lest they be chastised,' and doubtless he was puritanically severe in compelling them to abandon practices enjoined by long religious usage but incompatible with Buddhist teaching. But the unique fact in his regime was his constant insistence upon truth, justice, reverence and compassion, but above all compassion, in public administration no less than in private conduct.

Nor does it seem possible to doubt that so long as he lived the enlightened experiment was amazingly successful. After the victorious war which made Asoka loathe war, the reign was one of unbroken peace; a peace, moreover, which was extended beyond the borders of the empire, because independent poten-



**RAMPART TO PREVENT THE INCURSIONS OF BARBARIANS INTO CHINA**

The strength of the central government in China under the Emperor Shih Hwang Ti is indicated by the fact that he could undertake so ambitious a work as the building of the Great Wall, although, indeed, it was not completed by him. Forced labour alone was employed, but the cost of operations must have been immense. Here we see the section that crosses the hills above the Nankow Pass—another stretch is shown in page 443.

*Photo, Underwood*

## Beginnings of Roman Power

tates in their quarrels learnt to seek in the arbitration of the great king a better solution than in the arbitrament of battle.

When Asoka came to the throne of Magadha, Buddhism was but a minor sect. His own conversion to it inspired him with a missionary zeal which transformed it into one of the great religions of the world, though in India itself it fell back to a less than secondary position. Among the missionaries were Asoka's younger brother and sister, who carried it into Ceylon.

The peaceful and prosperous rule of Asoka favoured the high artistic development of the period; but we must not forget that it was powerful as well as peaceful. He held friendly communication not only with Antiochus I and II, whose territories were in contact with his own, but with Ptolemy, and with an Alexander who may have been the successor of Pyrrhus in Epirus.

Such an empire, however, as that of Asoka needs a succession of Asokas to weld it into permanence. Of what befell after his death in 232 we have the scantiest knowledge. The great dominion was, it seems, parted between two of his grandsons, and within fifty years the last of the Mauryas was dead. For centuries to come, Indian history is illuminated only by occasional sidelights; and we must now revert to the history of the West, and the decisive struggle which left the great Italian Republic the foremost world power.

### Outbreak of the Second Punic War

THE Second Punic War, like the first, falls into distinct stages, which can only be summarised here, since Hannibal's campaigns have detailed treatment in Chapter 56. The Roman plan of attack was to invade Africa at once with the first army, and at least disorganize Carthaginian mobilisation. The second army was sent to Massalia, in case Hannibal should interfere with friends of Rome north of the Ebro. A third force was obviously required to garrison the Gaulish territories between Apennines and Po, which had only surrendered three years before, and were known to have been

visited by agents of Hannibal, and to have promised him free passage if he should try to reach Italy by land.

Some of the Gauls indeed revolted at once, and delayed the departure of the northern force for Massalia, till it was too late to stop Hannibal even at the Rhône. For this was his master stroke, to circumvent both Roman sea power and Rome's Greek allies between Ebro and Alps, and establish an enemy base in the heart of the Roman dominion. He certainly counted on such measure of support from his friends in Carthage as would deplete the Roman garrisons in Italy, for the defence of Sicily and the south; with good fortune the Roman first army might be shut up in Africa, and destroyed there like that of Regulus.

### Hannibal's Adventures in Italy

FORTUNATELY, all the Roman commanders acted with true perspicacity. The southern army was diverted just as it was sailing for Africa, and brought round by sea to the Adriatic flank of the northern front, where the new military road gave it direct reinforcement from Rome. Consequently when Hannibal after unprecedented hardships descended on the Italian side of the Alps, he found a Roman field army strongly posted under shelter of the new garrison colonies on the Po.

More happily still, the force that was too late to intercept Hannibal at Massalia was led at once into Spain, to disorganize his only sure source of reinforcements, and undo the empire-building of his father and himself.

Hannibal's tactics and leadership, however, were as brilliant as his strategy. His first Italian campaign in 218 broke Roman resistance north of the Apennines at the fords of Trebia and Ticinus. His next destroyed their whole army (217) at Lake Trasimene in Etruria, and seemed to open the straight road to Rome. But the third year found him not at the gates of Rome, but far to the southward, now in Apulia, now in Campania; and even the victory in which he destroyed yet another whole army at Cannae (216), brought him no nearer to his object than when he abandoned Etruria.

There were several reasons for this. A flying column such as his necessarily consisted largely of cavalry, and for horse-pasture Italy has no large plains except in the far south. The greater corn-lands also are all remote from Rome; no nearer indeed than Campania. If Rome itself, therefore, did not fall at the first assault, it was necessary to find some such Italian base, and await reinforcements from Carthage or from Spain. And so far from taking Rome by assault, Hannibal did not come even within sight of its walls till after Cannae; for the great citizen-colonies along all lines of communication with the city blocked approach, resisted attack from light forces such as his, and threatened his rear if he left them unblockaded.

#### Roman Allies stand firm

So long as these outposts stood, the countryside dared not rise even if it wished to do so; and it was the worst disillusionment of Hannibal, that the peoples of Italy, and even what was left of the Etruscans, gave almost no sign of disaffection. Hannibal could remember the 'Truceless War' between Carthage and her mercenaries, and the African campaign of Regulus was only ten years before his birth; but this was quite another situation. The subjects of Carthage had been ready enough to make common cause with her enemies; but Rome's bold experiment of clemency after surrender, and progressive incorporation of old enemies in her own commonwealth, had succeeded too completely for panic or desertion to be possible.

Hannibal's first stroke then had failed. But he had established himself in southern Italy, where Pyrrhus had fought, and he had secured possession of Capua, the key to Campania; it was another thirteen years before he left Italy by his own choice. He had, however, no seaport, and, what was worse, no assurance of help from Carthage, which seems to have taken little further part in the war, except for a raid on Sardinia in 215 B.C., when it ought to have been sending men to Hannibal, and the landing of a small force in southern Italy in the following year.

Two strokes of ill luck, however, befell the Romans in this middle period of the war. Hiero of Syracuse died in 216 B.C., a very old man; ancient feuds broke out there at once, and the popular party seized the chance to revive old dreams of Syracusan empire. These were encouraged by Hannibal, and also by the Carthaginian government, which profited by the Sicilian revolt to reoccupy a large part of the island; and it was only after two years' blockade that Syracuse was recovered and Hiero's hoarded wealth made available for the conduct of the war. Even so, Carthaginian forces were not completely expelled from the province until 210.

The other misfortune was the dislike of Rome inspired by Illyrian refugees in Philip V of Macedon, and the help consequently rendered by him to Hannibal from oversea, until the Romans managed to capture his Adriatic ports, and distract his attention by encouraging a coalition of Greek cities against him, and accepting the overtures of the Aetolian League, with the significant consequence that while Philip was not able to be of much use to Hannibal, and still less to Carthage, Rome succeeded at very small cost in confirming the reputation she had long enjoyed for sympathy with Greek cities.

#### Success of Rome's Fabian Tactics

MEANWHILE, Hannibal's situation in Italy became steadily worse. Capua, which had fallen into his hands after his victory at Cannae, was besieged in 212 B.C. and destroyed utterly in the following year, in revenge for its treachery to Rome. Tarentum, which deserted to Hannibal in 212 B.C. and should have been invaluable, had Carthage used this direct means of communication to send him reinforcements, was retaken in 209 B.C.; and the long-expected risings in Etruria and in a few Latin towns, when they did at last take place, were half-hearted, and easily suppressed. The 'Fabian tactics' adopted by Q. Fabius Cunctator, of remaining on the defensive and refusing battle, had now been mastered by the Romans and gave the enemy little chance to gain spectacular successes like those of the first three campaigns; the whole country

## Beginnings of Roman Power

was sick of the war; the invader had outstayed his welcome, and a veteran army ages rapidly without reinforcements.

Hannibal had left in Spain his brother Hasdrubal, with instructions to follow with another flying column like the first. But the wise concurrence of the Senate in the strategy of the two Scipios, who had occupied first Massalia and then Tarraco near the mouth of the Ebro, in the first year of the war, quite deranged this plan. Their 'New Rome' at Tarraco was a serviceable counter-stroke to 'New Carthage,' and their personal qualities and diplomatic skill shook the allegiance of native leaders in Spain, and even in Numidia. There was a reaction, however, about 212 B.C., for the Spanish tribes found that they had only made a change of masters, and attempted to free themselves from the new ones. But the young and brilliant son of the consul of 218 volunteered for the Spanish command, and succeeded in 210 in capturing 'New Carthage,' and therewith much treasure, a serviceable fleet and, best of all, Hasdrubal's Spanish hostages.

### Brilliant Victory on the Metaurus

By this time, however, Hasdrubal was ready; he slipped past Scipio's forces, spent the winter of 208 quietly in the central highlands of Gaul, and entered Italy unopposed in 207 B.C. Only the skilful co-operation of the two consular armies prevented his junction with Hannibal, which seemed inevitable. Leaving in the south only a portion of his army, which effectively masked his movement, C. Claudius Nero raced north with a picked force, joined his colleague Livius, surprised, defeated and killed Hasdrubal at the Metaurus river, east of the Apennines, and was back in the south before Hannibal discovered that only a skeleton force had been facing him. The battle of the Metaurus destroyed his last hope of receiving reinforcements.

Meanwhile Scipio had expelled the remaining Carthaginian forces from Spain, defeated their counter-attack in 206, and persuaded Masinissa, a leading chief of the Numidians, to exchange the Carthaginian for a Roman alliance. Having returned

to Rome, he was then allowed (with grave misgiving among the older men) to raise a fresh army largely composed of Italian volunteers, for a blow at the heart of Carthaginian rule in Africa. Here, his old friendship with Masinissa enabled him to distract and eventually to capture Syphax, the chief Numidian ally of the Carthaginians, and to cut off at the source their supply of cavalry. Hannibal was paralysed; Rome had been relieved of the Macedonian complication in 205, and could concentrate now upon the war in Africa.

### Hannibal's last stand at Zama

By 202 B.C. the condition of the Carthaginian home territory was desperate. Hannibal, and his other brother, Mago, who had escaped from Spain and landed on the Riviera coast of Italy, were recalled to defend Carthage itself, and attempts were made to obtain peace before the situation became more serious. But Scipio and Masinissa, each for his own reasons, persisted; they defeated the last field army that Carthage could rake together at Zama, and were able to impose their own terms.

Carthage formally surrendered Spain, and all other dependencies outside the home district of Africa. Even within these narrow limits, no war was to be declared without Roman permission. All ships but ten were surrendered, all elephants, and prisoners of war; and the enormous indemnity that was imposed—ten thousand talents spread over fifty years—made the Carthaginians practically tributaries of their conqueror. Masinissa received the whole of Numidia and Roman citizenship, as the 'friend and ally' of the Roman people, so that he could invoke Roman intervention in Africa, whenever it was convenient. Hannibal was allowed to remain in Carthage, and did what he could to restore public confidence and credit. But his old political enemies were too strong for him, and in 196 B.C. he was banished, and spent the rest of his life at the courts of Greek kings in Syria and Asia Minor (an account of his vicissitudes is given in Chapter 56), still looking for occasions to damage Rome, and build up new combinations against her.





### STAGE ON WHICH ROME PLAYED OUT THE FIRST ACTS OF HER DRAMA

Illustrating the conditions in Italy during Rome's struggle first for existence and then for predominance, this map also serves Chronicle VII and the surrounding chapters. The period with which it deals stretches back to the beginning of the sixth century B.C., when Rome's rise or fall meant nothing to the Greek powers, and extends down to the Punic Wars, when these powers had begun to realize that it was no mere pack of Bruttian or Lucanian highlanders with whom they now had to reckon.

# ROME AND THE REASONS FOR HER LATER GREATNESS

How a small City State in the Centre of Italy became one of the Great Powers of the Mediterranean World

By H. STUART-JONES D.Litt.

Principal of University College of Wales, Aberystwyth; Late Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford; Author of *Classical Rome*, *The Roman Empire*, Etc.

**A**BOUT the middle of the second century before Christ the Greek historian Polybius, who had spent several years as a hostage in Rome and had gained the friendship of the most enlightened of her statesmen, set out to discuss why Rome had in the course of a few generations subjected 'almost the whole world' to her rule. He found the explanation in the judicious blending of monarchical, aristocratic and democratic elements in her constitution. This doctrine of the ideal state as one which should combine the merits of the three main forms of government he borrowed from Greek political theorists, and he took as an example the constitution which, as he believed, Lycurgus had bestowed on Sparta; but he was careful to add that whereas the Spartan lawgiver had been guided by abstract reason in framing his institutions, the Romans had built up the fabric of their state by the experience gained in long and arduous struggles, 'choosing the better course' in all their vicissitudes.

The idea was perhaps not his own; for Cato the Elder, as Cicero tells us in his work *On the Republic*, had attributed the superiority of Rome to the fact that her constitution was the product not of one mind but of many, and had been perfected, not in a single lifetime, but in the course of several ages and generations; and this profound utterance may well have reached the ears of Polybius. But the Greek historian adds that whereas the growth and decline of the Greek states are matters of readily ascertained historical fact, it is not easy to understand the working of Roman institutions because of their complication, and difficult to predict their future on

account of the ignorance which prevails concerning the past history of their characteristic forms. Yet he had done his best to discover what could be learnt of these matters and had made a first-hand examination of such original documents as were available, notably the treaties entered into by the Roman state, of which he gives an example in the text of the successive conventions made between Rome and Carthage, the earliest of which, he tells us, belonged to the first year of the Republic.

He had therefore grasped the truth that our sources for the early history of Rome must be approached in a critical spirit. The reasons for this are manifold. The Romans were late in

taking up the writing of history, and the first works in which they treated of their past were scarcely two generations earlier than the time of Polybius, and were composed in Greek by writers contemporary with the Hannibalic war. Could we believe that the Year Books ('*Annales*') which they compiled were derived from contemporary records we might accept the outlines of the narrative, based on their work and that of their successors, as giving at least a trustworthy framework of historical fact; but criticism shows that this is not so. We have, it is true, no continuous narrative of Roman Republican history in a complete form, but the first ten books of Livy cover the period from the origins of Rome down to 293 B.C., and for the earlier part of the story we have for comparison the Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Greek who came to Rome under Augustus and spent twenty-two years in learning

Sources for Rome's  
early History

the Latin language and studying the works of Roman writers. A contemporary of Livy and Dionysius, Diodorus the Sicilian, inserted in his Universal History brief notes on Western affairs, which some modern writers have thought worthy of special attention because it was his habit to copy verbally a single authority, in this case (as is supposed) one of the earlier Roman annalists. We also possess considerable remains of the table of annual magistrates ('Fasti,' see page 1607) and the Register of Triumphs compiled by order of Augustus and inscribed upon the walls of the Regia (the office of the Pontifex Maximus), which was rebuilt in marble in 36 B.C.; these, we must remember, are just as much a literary production as the works of the historians.


A comparison of these sources shows that no consistent version of the early

history of Rome was current in the reign of Augustus, nor even a reliable chronological framework. In his second book Livy writes of the perplexing errors in chronology which arise from the varying order in which the names of the chief magistrates are arranged by different authorities, so that it is impossible to trace either a regular series of consuls or of the events which took place in the various years; and in other passages he suggests some of the reasons for this. The records kept by the college of Pontifices, he tells us, were destroyed in the sack of Rome by the Gauls—a statement confirmed by an authority cited by Plutarch in his Life of Numa; and in a later passage, which refers to the events of 322 B.C., he writes:

It is difficult to prefer one version to another or one author to another; for I am persuaded that history has been corrupted by funeral panegyrics and false inscriptions on busts, by means of which each family endeavours to secure the credit of public achievements and magistracies.

In much the same words Cicero speaks of the family traditions, embodied in funeral orations, which have filled history with falsehoods—deeds which never were done, imaginary triumphs, multiplication of consulships and supposed resignations of patrician rank, which enabled plebeians of late times to claim descent from families of the same name who figured in the earlier records, 'as though,' he adds, 'I were to say that I was descended from the patrician M'. Tullius who was consul ten years after the expulsion of the kings.'

We are thus obliged to regard the details of early Roman history, such as it has come down to us in the main through Livy, with a sceptical eye; nor can we repose much greater confidence in the more technical account of Roman institutions and their development which we can piece together from the remains of the consti-




ALTAR PICTURE OF THE ROMULUS MYTH

This bas-relief on the altar, dated A.D. 124, found at Ostia, depicts Romulus and Remus being suckled by the wolf at the foot of the Palatine Hill, on the top of which the god of the hill is seated. Tiber, personified, looks on, and, above, the two shepherds who found the twins run to spread the news.

Museo delle Terme, Rome: photo, Alinari



Legend said that the trough in which Romulus and Remus were set adrift grounded at the foot of a fig tree below the Lupercal (right), the grotto of Faunus Lupercus on the Palatine. The early settlers on the hill buried their dead in deep shaft tombs (left) in the marshy valley later covered by the Forum, and in this 'sepulcretum' Romulus himself is reputed to have been buried.



Faustulus, the shepherd whose wife in the myth fostered Romulus and Remus, is probably a rationalised explanation of Faunus Lupercus, the divinity who protected the flocks from wolves. A shepherd's hut, known as the Casa Romuli, stood on the Cermalus, the northern knoll of the Palatine, and was preserved in good repair until the last days of the Roman Empire. About this spot the first Roman settlement gathered, and here are remains of the earliest stone buildings of Rome.

#### EXISTING REMAINS OF ROME BEFORE THE DAYS OF HER GREATNESS


*Photos by courtesy of Professor Halbherr*

tutional lawyers and antiquarians such as Cicero, Varro, the abridgements of the Encyclopaedia of Verrius Flaccus (a contemporary of Augustus who was perhaps the compiler of the *Fasti*) made by Festus and Paul the Deacon, and stray fragments of law books contained in the miscellany known as the *Attic Nights* of Gellius (who wrote in the second century A.D.) and elsewhere. These writers made use, it is true, of certain documents, notably the registers of various priestly colleges—such as the pontiffs and augurs—and of magistrates, especially the consuls and censors; but these were mainly concerned with procedure and precedent.

Moreover, the search for precedent led to the creation of quasi-historical legends (where the Athenians would have employed myth); and the insistence on principle, which made the Romans supreme in the field of law, caused the jurists to represent the institutions of Rome as a coherent whole and to obscure their gradual and sometimes haphazard growth. Some modern critics—including even Mommsen—have taken their statements too seriously and have treated Roman constitutional law as a definite and closed system. It will be better to rely, so far as is possible, on the evidence of survivals, which at Rome yields fruitful results by reason of the fact that it was the Roman habit, instead of discarding institutions which had outlived their usefulness, to retain them with restricted or altered functions and to set up others beside them, leaving the *modus vivendi* to be established by gradual adaptation.

Let us now examine the origins of Rome. 'From the beginning,' said Tacitus, 'Rome was ruled by kings'; and the current legend connected the first of these with the dynasty established, as was believed, at Alba Longa by the son of the Trojan

Aeneas. Now this legend is one of a class of which the object was to link up outlying communities with the Greek world through the heroes of the Epic cycle, and was therefore borrowed by the Romans from the Greek mythographers. Moreover, in its earliest form it assumed that Rome was founded two generations after the Trojan war, and when chronologists had fixed the date of the foundation in the eighth century B.C. a whole series of Alban kings had to be invented to bridge the gap. It is irrelevant here to criticise the Roman legends in detail; enough to bring into relief a few points of importance.



**EARLIEST INSCRIPTION IN ROME**  
A rectangular tufa stele, not later than the fifth century B.C., exhumed near the Forum, bears the earliest Latin inscription on stone. The word 'rex' significantly occurs on it.

great priests of the Roman state; he is often spoken of as 'rex sacrorum' (king of rites), but in the official calendar he appears as 'rex' only, and so too in the earliest inscription found in Rome, engraved on a stone pillar discovered in the Comitium or meeting-place

**Kingship in the Roman State**

of the people and dating probably from the fifth century B.C. The name of his palace—'regia' (see page 1750)—was retained as that of the centre of the state worship, where the 'pontifex maximus' had his office. But though religious conservatism led the Romans to retain a simulacrum of kingship, the idea of an 'heroic' dynasty ruling by divine right is conspicuously absent from their legends, and on the other hand the later kings are represented as Etruscan overlords, bearing the name Tarquinii, which is that both of a family and of a city in Etruria. In this the Romans spoke truly. Rome's first steps to greatness were taken in a period of foreign rule.

At the time when Roman history begins the Italian peninsula was occupied by a

diversity of races. The primitive inhabitants, presumably of Mediterranean stock, were represented by the Ligurians of the north-western coast and the mountains adjacent thereto, and by the inhabitants of Picenum on the Adriatic seaboard, who were assimilated by the invaders. In the north-east the Veneti, whose name survives in that of Venice, and in the south-east the Messapians were apparently immigrants from the other side of the Adriatic and belonged to the 'Illyrian' branch of the Indo-European race. In the south and on the fertile coast of the Bay of Naples Greek colonists had set foot. In what is now Tuscany the Etruscans, who, as tradition has it (and there is every reason to accept it—but the question is treated at length in Chapter 38), were immigrants from Asia Minor, had been settled since the ninth century B.C.

The remainder of the peninsula, including the plain and marshes of the Po, the mountainous backbone of the peninsula formed by the Apennine range and the volcanic plain of Latium with its adjacent hills, had for some centuries been occupied by successive waves of what for convenience we call 'Italic' invaders, partly during the Bronze Age and in increasing strength

during that of Iron (see Chap. 30). These invaders, who came, in all probability, from the Danube region, spoke a group of dialects which, while akin to Greek, also show (as we might expect) some marked resemblances to the Celtic tongues. Of these dialects the most marked and the best known to us are (besides Latin) the Umbrian, spoken in the upper valley of the Tiber and the adjacent regions, and the Oscan, prevailing in the southern half of the peninsula. From both of these the Latin speech differed more than either of them did from the other.

In what quarter was there to be found a power capable of unifying this congeries of peoples? The Italic stocks, rude and vigorous, but primitive in their customs and ideas, **Sense of order** had, it is true, a strong **among Italians** sense of order. Even the first wave of immigrants, who lived in 'terremare,' in other words, villages built on platforms resting on piles—an adaptation of the lake-dwellings of the Alpine regions to the physical conditions of the Po valley—must have rigidly subordinated the individual to the community, since their settlements are carefully orientated and regularly planned (see plan in page



**ETRUSCAN FEDERAL SANCTUARY OF THE GODDESS VOLTUMNA**

Archaeologists are now agreed that Orvieto in Perugia occupies the site of the ancient Volsinii, one of the twelve cities of the Etruscan League, which was destroyed by the Romans in 280 B.C. Excavations have disclosed the lower parts of the walls of a large rectangular temple, with remains of steps leading up to it. This temple was almost certainly the federal sanctuary of the goddess Voltumna, the place of assembly of the delegates of the Etruscan communities.

*Archaeological Museum, Florence, courtesy of Professor Halbherr*

914). Their successors were a disciplined and aggressive people, overspreading the greater part of the peninsula with swarms ejected from the parent hive when the means of subsistence became scarce, but forming only loose tribal agglomerations without political unity. There are small traces of monarchy to be found in their traditions, though the word 'rex' is common to them and the Celtic peoples, as we see from the element 'rix,' so frequent in Gaulish names, and the 'Ard-righ' (head king) of early Ireland. Of one stock we hear that they elected a king for war only (this may be paralleled elsewhere), and the priest-king with magical functions may possibly survive in Latium in the 'King of the Grove' (Rex Nemorensis) at Aricia,

the priest who slew the slayer  
and shall himself be slain.

It would be natural to seek the unifying force in the Etruscans, who came to Italy as the bearers of a higher material civilization; but they, too, were afflicted with the vice of disunion, and their League of Twelve Cities possessed no organ of

central authority, for though we hear of annual meetings at the 'Shrine of Voltumna' Rome always dealt separately with each of the Etruscan communities. But it was Etruscan rule which forged in Rome the instrument of future unification. When the age of Etruscan expansion began Latium was occupied by a number of communities of small individual importance, held together by the tie of a religious worship celebrated on the summit of the Alban mount in honour of the sky god. This did not prevent them from regarding war (which meant little more than cattle-raiding) as the normal relation between the various settlements, which for security were perched on the heights isolated by erosion in the volcanic tableland.


A group of such heights on the left bank of the Tiber clustered about the Palatine hill, which the Romans, rightly as it seems, though this has been disputed, regarded as the nucleus of their city. The primitive ceremony of the Lupercalia kept alive the memory of its boundary; and the inclusion of other villages was commemorated



**IMPRESSIVE REMNANTS OF THE FORMIDABLE WALLS OF KINGLY ROME**

Tufa quarries on the Palatine, Capitoline and Aventine Hills furnished the material for the first walls of ancient Rome. They were built of square blocks, 2 feet high and from 4 to 6 feet long, and were originally about 40 feet high. Under Servius Tullius, Alban stone, a conglomerate of volcanic origin now called peperino, began to be used, being harder and weathering better. Part of the Servian wall as it still stands near the railway station is shown above.

*Photo Anderson*



#### ROME'S CONSTITUENT VILLAGES

Rome's original 'Seven Hills,' commemorated in the festival of the Septimontium, are not those which the city subsequently covered, but a group within a smaller compass, here distinguished by darker type. They were once probably the sites of distinct settlements.


in historical times by the Septimontium, or 'festival of the Seven Hills'—not, however, those with whose names we are familiar, but a group of sites confined within a smaller area. In the valleys between were huddled together the graves of the dead with their rude tomb furniture, including the characteristic 'hut urns' which show that the rectangular house had succeeded the round hut, for domestic purposes, among the Latins of the Early Iron Age.

Hither came the Etruscans on their southward march towards the fertile soils of Latium and Campania. Rome became their bridge-head on the Tiber, and the Tarquinii, who probably established their power early in the sixth century B.C., developed the cluster of villages into a prosperous city, into which flowed the products of Mediterranean industry and commerce.

The soil of Rome has not yielded such rich treasures as some Etruscan sites, or others such as Praeneste (Palestrina)

which, like Rome, fell under Etruscan sway, but this may be explained by the fact that during centuries of occupation and rebuilding the richly furnished burial-vaults must have been rifled of their contents. Nor is it easy to say whether native craftsmen learnt to produce such works as the gold brooch found at Praeneste on which we read, in the words of the earliest known Latin inscription, 'Manios made me for Numasios.' Tradition has it that Etruscan builders were summoned to erect the temple of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva on the Capitol, barely completed when the monarchy fell; and the Vicus Tuscus ('Street of the Etruscans') no doubt owed its name to the settlers who practised their crafts there. But the tradition that Numa was the first to organize 'collegia' or guilds of handicraftsmen at Rome points to the existence of local industries in the regal period.

If the Etruscan rulers introduced the Romans to the higher material culture developed in the eastern Mediterranean, they also (which was of greater importance) laid the foundations of her dominance among the Latin tribes. Here again we may place little reliance on the details of the traditions which tell of the destruction of Alba by Tullus Hostilius, and of other conquests made by the kings in the neighbourhood of Rome; but it is significant that the treaty with Carthage which Polybius dates to the beginnings of the Republic distinguishes Latins 'subject to Rome' from those who are independent, and includes coast-towns as far distant as Antium and Terracina amongst the former, while the 'treaty



#### ETRUSCAN BROOCH FOR ROMAN WEAR

This gold fibula, found at Praeneste, is probably of Etruscan workmanship. It carries the oldest Latin inscription on metal. As on the stele shown in page 1614 the letters are Greek in form, and their retrograde order and the use of FH for F ('fhefhaked' = 'fecit') point to the sixth century B.C.

From 'Römische Mittheilung'



of Cassius' (a copy of which was read by Cicero on a bronze tablet set up in the Roman Forum), placed by tradition in 493 B.C., was made between Rome on the one part and the Latin League on the other. The net result, therefore, of Etruscan rule was to mark out Rome as the destined leader of that branch of the Italic race which from its central position in the peninsula, at the crossing of one of the few important water-ways with the main route from north to south, was fitted to play a chief part in moulding a specifically Italian civilization, borrowing much from the earlier cultures, but capable of supplying the strong bulwark of political solidarity which alone could enable it to withstand and ultimately to dominate the assaults of barbarism.

It is much more doubtful whether Rome owed a debt to her Etruscan kings in respect of her institutions. The antiquarians of Cicero's

Roman Constitution  
not Etruscan

time spoke of certain  
Etruscan Books of  
Ceremonies ('rituales

libri') which prescribed 'the rites to be observed in the foundation of cities and the consecration of altars and temples, the sanctity of walls and gates, the mode of ordering tribes, curiae and centuries and of arraying armies, and other matters pertaining to war and peace.' But this proves too much. It is evident that 'tribes, curiae and centuries' refer to the three forms under which the assemblies of the Roman people were summoned, and these were certainly not all framed on Etruscan models. The evidence of language is really decisive, for there is no trace of Etruscan in Roman constitutional terminology; and the most characteristic feature of the state religion, namely, the observation of the flight of birds ('auspicia') in order to ascertain the will of heaven, belongs to a different order of ideas from the examination of the entrails of sacrificial victims ('haruspicina') practised by the Etruscans, and is shown to be Italic by its occurrence in the ritual of the 'Tables of Iguvium' written in the Umbrian dialect.

An examination of the earliest Roman cult shows, in fact, that it preserved with the utmost conservatism features in-

herited from the primitive ages of stone and bronze, and its calendar of festivals, which are those of a people whose interests were divided between farming and fighting, has nothing Etruscan about it. What the Etruscans did was to introduce the Romans to the anthropomorphic conceptions of Greek religion with their embodiment in art types. These they had themselves borrowed from the Greeks, and by transmitting them they initiated the long process by which the unseen powers known to the Italic stocks as 'numina' gave place to the Hellenic pantheon with its gorgeous ritual.

The foundation of the Roman Republic formed a landmark in the ebb of Etruscan power, which had begun with the repulse of their attack on Cumae in Campania by the Greek tyrant Aristodemus. This event is traditionally dated in 524 B.C.; and in 505 B.C. we find the Campanian forces under the same leader assisting in the liberation of Latium by defeating the son of Lars Porsenna at Aricia. During the century that followed, the decline of Etruria continued. Etruscan sea power never recovered from the defeat inflicted by Hieron of Syracuse in 474 B.C. on the allied fleets of Etruria and Carthage; and in the latter half of the century Capua, which the Etruscans had founded in the rich Campanian plain, fell before the onslaught of the hardy mountaineers of Italic race known as the Samnites.

Meanwhile Rome and the Latins were waging a constant struggle against their neighbours on all sides. Sabines on the north, Aequi from the mountains on the east and Volscians from the chain of hills (now the Monti Lepini) to the south of the Alban mount, were pressing forwards to the fertile coastland; and the monotonous records of yearly raids contained in Livy and the Register of Triumphs, however untrustworthy in detail, may be taken as good evidence of the process by which the Roman sword was forged and tempered. Throughout the fifth century the tide ebbed and flowed. Tusculum fell into the hands of the Aequi, who entered Latium by way of the corridor between the central range and the volcanic formations of the

Tribal struggle  
for existence

Alban hills; the Volscians took Velitrae, Ardea and the whole of the sea-coast from Antium down to Terracina, which they renamed Anxur, and the legend of Coriolanus shows them at the gates of Rome.

But the Latins, with Rome at their head, fought on stubbornly and in the end successfully. The league displayed those powers of expansion and assimilation which Rome was afterwards to exhibit on a far greater scale; they posted their 'colonies' as outliers at well-chosen points of vantage—Signia, Velitrae, Norba and the like—and admitted to their alliance a kindred stock, the Hernici, who harassed the Aequi in the rear. Towards the close of the century these latter were finally driven back to their hill-fastnesses, and in 406 B.C., if the traditional date be correct, the coastline was finally secured by the recapture of Anxur-Terracina.

To the north Rome had her special problem with which to deal. The regions on the right bank of the Tiber above Rome, though inhabited by tribes akin to Rome and speaking cognate dialects, had fallen under Etruscan domination. About twelve miles north of Rome was the strongly fortified city of Veii, which, though not lying on the main stream but on a small tributary, the Cremera, controlled the bridge-head at Fidenae, a Latin town on the left bank, and through it an alternative route from north to south. Under Etruscan rule Veii rivalled

Rome in all material respects, and recent excavations on the site have brought to light masterpieces of archaic terra-cotta sculpture. The rulers of the Roman Republic soon realized that there was no room for two powerful cities in the lower Tiber valley, and a long and bitter struggle ensued, which was embellished in tradition by such famous legends as that of the massacre of the whole fighting contingent of the Fabian gens on the Cremera. Even in Augustus' day the spoils taken by Aulus Cornelius Cossus from the fallen leader of the army of Fidenae (which fell into the hands of the Romans in 428 B.C.) were shown as a venerated relic. Ultimately Veii fell in 396 B.C., after a ten years' siege.

This decisive success opened the way for a further advance. Falerii and Capena fell under Roman control, and Rome's northern boundary was advanced to the natural limit in southern Etruria set by the Ciminian forest. It was conclusively shown that the Etruscan League of cities lacked the cohesive force which might have enabled it to keep Rome at bay. Veii received no aid from her northern neighbours, and Caere, the southernmost of the Etruscan towns in the coastal region, was consistently friendly towards Rome. The annexed territory of Veii was parcelled out by the Romans into four new 'tribes' (see Chapter 55), and the land hunger of the



#### TESTIMONY TO THE WEALTH OF ONE OF ROME'S EARLY RIVALS

Veii, Rome's nearest and most formidable Etruscan rival, was finally stormed and destroyed in 396 B.C. Ruins of its walls, forum, acropolis with temples, and necropolis have been unearthed. Among recent archaeological finds are these terra-cotta ridge tiles representing the snake-haired Medusa (centre) and, as is shown by his bull-horns, the Greek river god Achelous.

*Photos, Dr. Thomas Laby and Italian Department of Antiquities*

citizens was appeased by the allotment of holdings in this region.

The advance of Rome was checked by a disaster which bulks large in her legendary history—the capture and sack of the city by a Gallic horde. The recorded details of the Celtic inroads, which completely changed the face of northern Italy, are not to be trusted; it is not even certain whether the invaders entered the peninsula by the western passes or by the Brenner route and the valley of the Adige; but we may safely reject the version of the story mentioned by Livy,

according to which the invasion took place as early as 600 B.C., and assign the beginnings of the movement to the latter part of the fifth century B.C. The Celtic tribes established themselves in the whole region between the Alps and the Po (except in the extreme north-east, where the Veneti retained their independence); then, crossing the river, occupied a strip of territory on the Adriatic coast, dispossessed the Etruscan and Umbrian settlers to the north of the Apennines and, crossing the main chain, descended on Etruria and the western coast-lands. One of their hordes met and defeated the Roman army on the banks of the Allia, a tributary of the Tiber, in 390 B.C. (according to the Roman chronologists: 387 B.C. was the date given by the Greek writers whom Polybius followed); the city was stormed and sacked, and though the Capitol proved impregnable and withstood a seven months' siege, the withdrawal of the besiegers was only purchased at the price of 1,000 pounds of gold.

Rome's recovery from this blow was a triumph of tenacity and statesmanship. Her old enemies, the Aequi and Volsci on the one hand, the Etruscan cities on the other, once more raised their heads, and Rome had to fight on all fronts. The victories ascribed to the almost legendary hero, M. Fabius Camillus, the conqueror of Veii, may be mythical; but the results of the struggle are not to be disputed. Rome withstood all onslaughts; southern Etruria was secured by the establishment of 'Latin' colonies at Sutrium and Nepes; the Volscians were held in check by similar

foundations at Satricum and Setia, and on the coastal strip between their hills and the sea two fresh 'tribes' were set up—Publilia and Pomptina—and Roman citizens settled on the land; and the leadership of the Latins was retained, not without some exertion of force against dangerous rivals such as Praeneste. Further Gallic raids were repulsed, and, with a wider outlook in view, Rome (having renewed the Latin alliance in 358 B.C.) made treaties with the Samnites of central Italy in 354 B.C. and with Carthage in 348 B.C.

The next step in Rome's progress is marked by an event of which the traditional account has met with much criticism in modern times. Since their expulsion of the Etruscans from Capua in the fifth century, the 'people of the plain' (Campani, as they came to be called) had enjoyed increasing prosperity which aroused the envy of the other branch of their stock, the Samnites proper, who in their turn descended from the mountains and endeavoured to subdue them. According to Livy they appealed to Rome for aid, and when this was at first declined on the ground of the treaty mentioned above, they solemnly made over their liberties and their territory to the Romans by an act of surrender ('deditio'), and the 'First Samnite War' followed, in which three campaigns sufficed to check the advance of the mountaineers. Some modern historians

regard the whole story as an invention, mainly on the ground that it is ignored by Diodorus, who, for some reason, gives only the most meagre references to events connected with Rome in this period. Others (though rightly sceptical about the 'deditio') look upon Rome's intervention in Campania as a master-stroke of policy intended to secure a backing in the inevitable settlement of accounts with the Latin allies. Sure it is that these latter, alarmed by the growth and consolidation of Roman power, brought matters to a head in 340 B.C. by demanding, not merely a revision of the existing treaty, but (if the story be true) incorporation in the Roman state on terms of political equality, with

Outbreak of the  
First Samnite War

the reservation of one of the consulships for themselves.

This was refused, and a war followed, in which the Latins received assistance from some of their neighbours on the south, though the aristocracy of Capua remained faithful to Rome. Its most dramatic incident (if we may believe Livy) was the act of self-sacrifice performed with due ceremony by P. Decius Mus in a battle fought on the slopes of Mount Vesuvius (see page 1419). The result was decisive, and in 338 B.C. Rome found herself undisputed mistress of the Latin and Campanian coast plains and the intervening hills, and by far the most considerable single power in Italy. In the organization of her territories which followed, her statesmen did not fail her. 'Force without stint or measure' had been applied where a vital question was at issue; but with an eye to the future an elastic form of government was devised which left room for indefinite development.

The cities of the Latin League, including Rome, had enjoyed certain reciprocal rights in each other's territories. They could acquire and alienate landed and other property in any of

**Privileges of the Latin League** the Latin communities and could sue and be sued in the local courts under the forms of law therein observed ('*commercium*'), and they could contract a marriage with a member of any Latin community, the issue of which would possess full rights ('*conubium*'). They could also change their domicile and become naturalised as full citizens in another Latin state if certain conditions were observed ('*jus migrandi*'). These rights were also enjoyed by the members of the Latin 'colonies' planted to secure extensions of Latin territory.

Rome now dissolved the ancient league for political purposes, retaining only the annual religious celebrations at which each city was represented. The individual cities (unless otherwise dealt with) continued to enjoy the same reciprocal relations with herself as they had done in the past, but not with each other; and Rome found it convenient to utilise this status in the creation of fresh outposts which were still called 'Latin' colonies, although they

were not founded by the old League. But several of the Latin cities in the regions nearest to Rome were directly incorporated into the Roman state, while at the same time retaining their old institutions for purposes of administration. To such towns the name of '*municipia*' was given, and its derivatives to this day recall the fact that the idea of an adjustment of the functions of central authority and local autonomy germinated in the Roman mind in the fourth century B.C.

It was supplemented by the notion of graduated and probationary privilege.

To some of the outlying cities there was granted the 'citizenship without the vote,' which meant

#### Latin Colonies and Municipalities

that their inhabitants enjoyed all the civil rights of Roman citizens in the eye of the law, but could not exercise the suffrage in the Roman assemblies, nor, of course, hold public offices in Rome. These towns, of course, had their local governments, and after a certain lapse of time they were promoted to full '*municipal*' status. If the statements made by some of our ancient authorities are correct, this '*half-citizenship*' had already been conferred upon the town of Caere in southern Etruria some years before the Latin war, but this seems to be inconsistent with the better authenticated tradition. A new experiment was tried which also had a great future—the dispatch of 'colonies of Roman citizens' which in the first instance served as garrisons to hold the more important harbours. It was a current tradition that a settlement of this kind had been established in the regal period at Ostia, beside the mouth of the Tiber; but a thorough exploration of the site has shown that this is only a legend. There is, however, no reason to doubt that Antium on the seaboard of Latium received a colony of three hundred citizens after the Latin war.

Naturally Rome continued to form alliances with varying degrees of closeness with the communities beyond her new borders. Two of the most important Latin cities, Tibur and Praeneste, were bound to her by treaty on specially favourable terms; and in the south of Campania the Greek communities were attracted

into her orbit, and shortly after the Latin war Neapolis (Naples) became a staunch ally, whilst retaining her Greek character and institutions.

Unforeseen problems of course arose in the administration of the newly organized territories, and Rome solved them one by one. The colonists of Antium complained that they had no organs of self-government and were granted a charter—the first of many by which a common municipal type was elaborated, modelled on the con-

was to be unified, it was Rome and not a decadent Etruria, nor a Campania which lacked the strength to stand alone against the aggression of the mountain-dwellers, to whom the leadership must fall.

But there was still hard fighting to be done. Rome secured herself as far as might be against attack from the north by making a treaty with the Gauls in 334 B.C., possibly because she foresaw the inevitable clash with the Samnites. In 338 B.C., the pressure of these latter, and the kindred



HOW AN ETRUSCAN ARTIST SAW HIS TROUBLESOME GALLIC NEIGHBOURS

The Gauls were a fourth and doubtful factor in the three-sided struggle between Rome, Etruria and Samnium. In 334 B.C. they were in alliance with Rome, who wished her hands free to deal with Samnium; in 299 they were in alliance with Etruria. These conditions are reflected in Etruscan terra-cotta figures found at Civita Alba, ostensibly of the Gauls who attacked Delphi in 278, but chosen because of the artist's familiarity with them at home. Other figures appear in page 1511.

From Rossetti, 'Rome,' Oxford University Press.

stitution of the mother city. Again, the application of the Roman civil law to the needs of the largely increased number of citizens or half-citizens living at a distance from Rome soon called into being a class of officials known as 'praefecti,' some appointed as delegates by the magistrates of Rome, others elected by the people (whose functions were exercised in Campania); and as Rome's sphere of influence in Italy widened, assize-towns ('praefecturae') were set up as seats of Roman justice, for example at Anagnia, the centre of the old Hernican confederacy, which lost its independence in 306 B.C. In these and other ways Rome built up a framework into which new elements could easily be fitted, while the superiority of her institutions and especially of her laws to those of the more backward peoples of the peninsula exerted a powerful centripetal force. It was already clear that if Italy

stock of the Lucanians, on the Greek cities of southern Italy brought into the field Archidamus, king of Sparta, who landed in the south-east but soon fell in battle. He was the first of several Greek potentates who sought adventure in the West; in 334 B.C. Alexander of Epirus, an uncle of Alexander the Great, followed in the steps of Archidamus, defeated both Samnites and Lucanians in the field and made proposals to Rome for common action; but the Greeks soon began to suspect his intentions and in 332 B.C. he was murdered.

These events no doubt delayed the outbreak of the conflict between Rome and Samnium, which began in 327 B.C. The first phase lasted until 304 B.C.; its most dramatic episode was that of the capitulation of the main Roman army at the Caudine Forks (321 B.C.) and the signature of a peace which was repudiated by the Senate and

people; but it deserves less notice than the persistency with which Rome pursued her end by a judicious combination of policy and force. As she had held Latium in a vice by bringing Campania under her influence, so she sought a foothold against Samnium on the Adriatic coast, where the Apulians became her allies and enabled her to establish a 'Latin' colony at Luceria which was a thorn in the side of Samnium. In order to keep her communications open, and at the same time to cut off the Samnites from northern Italy it was essential to secure the neutrality, if not the active assistance, of the 'Sabellian' tribes of the centre, and in this she was successful.

Thus when the tide turned against the Samnites and they invoked the aid of the Etruscan cities in 311 B.C., the intervention came too late; the Roman armies crossed the Ciminian forest and won a series of victories which put an end to all danger from the north. Finally some of the central Italian peoples took alarm; the Hernici, amongst the earliest allies of Rome, revolted and were reduced to submission; the Aequi disappear from history after a last campaign, and in 304 B.C. the Samnites sued for peace and obtained it. But the fact that

they re-entered the Roman alliance on the old terms makes it clear that the war of attrition had exhausted both parties, and that the struggle would soon be resumed.

Rome had gained allies in Campania, especially the wealthy city of Nola, and she secured the valuable friendship of the Frentani, the easternmost of the 'Sabellian' tribes, whose territory extended to the Adriatic and bordered Samnium on the north. A series of 'Latin' colonies was founded, notably Alba Fucens and Carsoli on the lands once occupied by the Aequi, Sora on the Liris and Narnia in Umbria, an outpost on the north-east, as well as two citizen colonies on the Campanian coast at Minturnae and Sinuessa. The encirclement of Samnium was well nigh complete. Nor should we forget that the laying out of the Appian Way, the first of the great military highways which were to spread like a network wherever the Roman armies planted foot, belongs to the critical period of the war.

In 299 B.C. a fresh swarm of Gauls crossed the Alps, and in conjunction with Etruscans raided Roman territory with some success. The news of this seems to

The encirclement  
of Samnium




**VIEW ALONG THE APPIAN WAY: ROME'S ANCIENT HIGHWAY TO THE EAST**

To Appius Claudius, censor 312 B.C., belongs the credit of initiating Rome's wonderful network of military highways with the Appian way, named after him. It issued from the Appian gate and proceeded through Latium, Campania, Samnium and Apulia to the port of Brundisium, the modern Brindisi, thus constituting the highway to the East. The ruins shown beside it here are of the great Claudian aqueduct, begun by Caligula in A.D. 38 and finished by Claudius fourteen years later.

have tempted the Samnites to make a desperate bid for release from the inexorable pressure of Rome, and they picked a quarrel over Rome's relations with the Lucanians to the south of Samnium. Rome took up the challenge promptly, and the inscription in rude Saturnian verse, which may still be read on the sarcophagus of Scipio 'the Bearded,' speaks of his victories, perhaps with some exaggeration. But a coalition was formed in northern Italy, comprising Gauls, Etruscans and Umbrians, joined by a Samnite force, and a critical struggle followed, which was decided in Rome's favour by the great victory of Sentinum (295 B.C.), in which Decius Mus repeated the act of self-sacrifice performed by his father in the Latin war. For the time being the northern boundary was secure, and Rome gradually got the better of the obstinate resistance of the Samnites, securing the south by a Latin colony of twenty thousand settlers in 291 B.C., and in the same or the following year peace was re-established.

The Samnites were confined to their fastnesses, and Rome took a further step on the path towards Italian unification. Central Italy was secured, partly by alliances with the Sabellian tribes which had not attained to city life, and partly by the incorporation of the Sabines into the Roman state as 'citizens without the vote' in 290 B.C. (they received full rights twenty-two years later). Thus when the Gallic tribe of the Senones, who occupied a strip of the Adriatic coast-line, made a raid into Etruria in 285 B.C., they were soon defeated, their lands were overrun and annexed, and the garrison-colony of Sena (Sinigaglia) was planted on the seaboard; and a further onslaught by another Gallic stock, the Boii, who obtained some help from the Etruscan cities, was crushed at Lake Vadimo in the following year. For half a century there was peace in the north.

There remained the question of southern Italy, where the Greek cities, whose natural leader was Tarentum, were confronted with the Italic stocks of the Lucanians and




**TOMB OF A GREAT SON OF A GREAT PATRICIAN HOUSE**

Of the patrician families of Rome none was more illustrious than that of the Scipios of the Cornelian gens. One of the earliest to gain high eminence was Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus who, when consul in 298 B.C., defeated the Etruscans at Volaterrae and afterwards fought against the Samnites. His victories are recorded in Saturnian verse on this sarcophagus in the family tomb beside the Appian way (see page 1646). This Scipio was great-great-grandfather of the conqueror of Hannibal.

*Vatican Museum; photo, Alinari*

Bruttii, against whom they maintained their independence with great difficulty, summoning to their aid a series of Greek adventurers, some of whom, like Cleonymus of Sparta and Agathocles, tyrant of Syracuse, proved a scourge to friend and foe. In 282 B.C. Thurii, menaced by the Lucanians, appealed to Rome for aid. The relations of Rome with the Greek

He was the nephew of Alexander, who has been mentioned above, and the son-in-law of Agathocles of Syracuse, and no doubt cherished the notion of bringing southern Italy and Sicily under his protection and building up a monarchy which should rank with those of Macedonia, Syria and Egypt. Italy was thus drawn into the orbit of Mediterranean politics, and



#### FRAGMENT FROM ROME'S HISTORICAL REGISTER

Said to date from the time of Numa, the Regia was the headquarters of the Pontifex Maximus (high priest) and the repository of the priestly archives. The building, reconstructed in 36 B.C., stood in the Forum, and on its walls were exhibited the 'fasti consulares,' inscriptions on marble compiled by Augustus recording the magistrates from the city's foundation. This fragment gives the names of those—Appius Claudius among them—who held office during the Pyrrhic and the Second Punic Wars.

world had long been friendly—so much so that a Greek writer of the fourth century, Heraclides of Pontus, could speak of her as a 'Greek city'—and her generous treatment of Naples had doubtless made a favourable impression. She was now called upon to make a momentous decision, since it must have been evident to far-seeing politicians that her intervention would inevitably lead to the extension of her sphere of political influence to the bounds of the peninsula.

Pliny the Elder tells us that at Thurii there was a statue of the tribune of the plebs who proposed to the people that Rome should take up arms in defence of Thurii against the Lucanians; and from this it has been inferred that the Roman democracy, which had just acquired sovereign power, was 'imperialistic' in its aims; but the evidence is hardly conclusive. Matters, however, moved rapidly. Thurii was relieved, and other Greek towns received Roman garrisons; but Rome became embroiled with Tarentum, and as the Roman forces gained the upper hand, the Tarentines called in the aid of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, which that ambitious and intriguing monarch was only too ready to give (see Chronicle VII).

Rome, as her leading power, was forced to take up the challenge.

We are not here concerned with the details of this famous war and its dramatic episodes—Pyrrhus's dash for Latium, which failed in face of the unbroken solidarity of Rome's allies, and the crisis of 279 B.C., when, after Pyrrhus's second victory, the Senate wavered, but was confirmed in its resolution not to treat for peace by a memorable speech delivered by the blind Appius Claudius, the text of which was still to be read in Cicero's time. What we should note is that Carthage, which was on the point of establishing her supremacy in Sicily, approached Rome with proposals for a treaty of mutual guarantee, which were accepted. Both parties pledged themselves not to make a separate peace with Pyrrhus; but each was jealous of its own sphere of interest, and neither was anxious to see the armed forces of the other in occupation of its territories. Hence Rome politely declined the aid of a Punic fleet which cruised off the coast of Latium, nor did Carthage seek her aid when Pyrrhus invaded Sicily, and with his accustomed dash carried all before him in his first campaign. He wasted three invaluable years in his effort



to subdue the island, and by the time he returned to Italy Rome had strengthened her position in the south, where the elements friendly to Pyrrhus regarded him as a traitor to their cause. In 275 B.C. he fought his last battle with Rome near Beneventum, was decisively defeated, threw up the game and retired.

All that remained was to gain possession of Tarentum, which was held for Pyrrhus by an Epirote garrison. The city was besieged by a Roman army and blockaded by a Carthaginian fleet. Carthage would no doubt have preferred to secure some independence for Tarentum rather than see it become a Roman fortress. But Pyrrhus's commandant made his bargain with Rome, marched out with the honours of war, and placed the key of southern Italy in Roman hands in 272 B.C.

In the years that followed only a few minor operations were needed to consolidate the Italian federation, to bring some

few communities which stood outside it into one of the various forms of relationship under which

Rome cloaked her supremacy, and to plant a number of the Latin colonies of the type which had proved so useful as strong points in the Samnite wars; the most important of these were Ariminum (Rimini) at the mouth of the Rubicon, the northern boundary of Roman Italy, and Beneventum, on the route from Campania to the Adriatic coast, both of which were founded in 268 B.C. Rome was now acknowledged as a great power; and only four years later she became involved in the struggle with Carthage which was to end in the establishment of her predominance in the western Mediterranean.

This lies beyond our present scope; but before the march of events brought Hannibal into Italy we have to record the completion of the Roman tribesystem in 241 B.C. by the incorporation of the Picentes, most of whom had become 'half-citizens' immediately after the Pyrrhic war, in a new tribe named Velina with full rights, and that of the Sabines, now fully Romanised, in another (Quirina), and the liquidation of the question of Cisalpine Gaul. The period of peace in this region which began in

284 B.C. was broken in 238 B.C. by a further irruption of Transalpine Gauls, but the movement was broken by internal dissensions. A few years later a far more serious menace developed, which Polybius (almost our only authority for these events) brings into connexion with a measure proposed by the democratic leader, Gaius Flaminius, in 232 B.C. The strip of coast-land from which, as we saw, Rome had expelled the Senones was parcelled out into lots and assigned to Roman citizens, and this, says the Greek historian, alarmed the Gauls living in the Po valley, notably the Insubres (in the neighbourhood of Milan) and the Boii, who occupied the modern Romagna and had founded Bononia (modern Bologna) on the site of the Etruscan city of Felsina. They secured the aid of a large contingent from beyond the Alps, and invaded Etruria. Rome made a great effort; an army of more than 150,000 men took the field, and the Gaulish host was smitten at Telamon in 225 B.C.—the date suggests that Polybius' explanation of the cause of the war may be mistaken.

This time the Romans were not content with repelling the invader. Their armies crossed the Po, reduced the Boii to submission in 224 B.C. and the Insubres two years later. Two Latin colonies—Cremona and Placentia—were settled on the river, and the defeated peoples became tributary to Rome. The other principal Celtic tribe in this region was that the Cenomani, who had taken no part in the raid, and became allies of Rome, as well as the non-Celtic Veneti, and when Hannibal crossed the Alps in 218 B.C. the Roman confederation embraced the whole of the peninsula.

Polybius incorporates in his account of the last Gallic war an official document giving the contingents furnished by Rome and her allies, as well as the total Military strength of number of those Roman Confederation liable for military service, which he estimates at 700,000 foot and 70,000 horse. The figures which he gives raise certain difficulties, but the totals may be accepted as approximately correct. The Roman citizens and half-citizens accounted for 250,000 foot and 23,000 horse, so that there was a consider-

able preponderance of non-Romans in the armies of the federation, and there is reason to think that a larger percentage of allies was called up for active service, especially in the cavalry arm.

Such was the power which Hannibal challenged with striking forces that consisted of 50,000 foot and 9,000 horse. We have traced the various stages of the process by which it was built up, and may now review the elements of which it consisted. The nucleus, of course, was formed by the citizens of Rome, whether in enjoyment of full privileges, including the vote in the Roman assemblies, or restricted to the private rights of the 'jus civile.' This body included far more than the original Latin stock. The territories which it occupied formed a block extending on the west coast of Italy from Graviscae on the Etruscan seaboard to Cumae, which marched with Neapolis, including the rich lands of southern Etruria, Latium and Campania, together with the hilly regions once occupied by the Volsci, to which had been added a broad central strip of mountainous Sabine territory forming a bridge between the upper Tiber valley and the Adriatic slope, with the valleys and coast-line from the neighbourhood of Ariminum down to that of Hadria (Atri), both Latin colonies.

This band of citizen-territory gave Rome a firm hold on the centre of the peninsula, barring any hostile coalition between north and south, together with great material wealth.

**Gradual Romanisation of the Peninsula** It contained only a few enclaves of non-Roman territory,

notably that of the two ancient allies of Rome, Tibur and Praeneste; but its population was far from homogeneous. The expansion of the Latin population had been provided for by the settlement of lands acquired by conquest and formed into 'tribe' districts—in southern Etruria, where Veii once stood, in southern Latium and part of the Volscian territories, in the 'Falernian land' bordering on Capuan territory to the north, on the upper Anio beyond Tibur, and in the 'Gallic land' south of Ariminum. There were also ten or more garrison towns on the coast-line in the shape of citizen colonies. But

Caere was inhabited by Etruscans, Arpinum and the neighbouring districts by Volscians, the Sabine hills and the coast of Picenum by the old Italic stocks which gave their name to those regions, and Campania by the Oscans, who retained their language, constitution and customs. All these were in process of Romanisation, and in particular were learning from the 'praefecti' who administered the 'jus civile' the great principles of Roman law; but the strength of their attachment to Rome was yet to be tried in the furnace of the Punic invasion, and in Capua it was unequal to the strain.

Next in order we may take the 'Latin' colonies, which, owing to the survival of the league-constitution to which the earlier members of the class owed their being, **Colonial outposts of Roman influence** were in form independent and sovereign

communities bound to Rome by treaty, but were in reality (apart from their strategical importance) outposts of Roman life and centres from which Roman influences radiated. Colonised either by Roman citizens or by allies who quickly became merged with them, they had constitutions which conformed closely to the Roman type; and in their private transactions with Rome their citizens were governed by the civil law. Rome had, however, found it necessary to place some restriction on their rights, especially that of the acquisition of full citizenship by migration to Rome, in the course of the third century B.C., and a new class of Latin colonies of inferior privilege was created when Ariminum was founded in 268 B.C.

The sites of the later colonies were admirably chosen from the military point of view. A quadrilateral formed by Aesernia, Luceria, Beneventum and Venusia kept the Samnites and their nearest kinsmen, the Hirpini, under vigilant control. Paestum on the west stood guard over the Lucanians. Brundisium (Brindisi) in the south-east (besides its importance as the port of embarkation for the eastern Mediterranean) was well placed to keep watch on Tarentum. Cremona and Placentia faced the Celtic tribes, whose loyalty was more than doubtful.

Outside the circle of privileged communities stood the rank and file of Rome's allies, each bound to her by its own treaty. The terms of these instruments varied according to circumstances. In the Greek world it was customary for cities to form alliances for a term of years, and this practice was followed by the Etruscans and by Rome in her earlier relations with that people; but the Romans preferred to make treaties stipulating for mutual assistance in war 'for all time,' and this became the stereotyped form in the Italian federation. But within this framework Rome found room for a graduation of privilege. It was given to few to possess a 'treaty of equality' ('*foedus aequum*') with the great power; such were the two ancient Latin cities of Tibur and Praeneste, Neapolis and some of the Greek towns in southern Italy, notably Heraclea. In the bulk of the treaties Rome's position as the predominant partner was explicitly recognized by the clause: 'Let them loyally observe the majesty of the Roman people.'

The contracting parties, again, were of various types—city states, leagues of towns or tribes, or cantonal communities which had not attained to the urban stage

of civilization. In this respect Italy presented a chequered picture at the coming of Hannibal. Rome herself was essentially a city state, and was long in finding the path to a higher form of community; but she did little (except by the example of her colony foundations) to promote the extension of urban life. The 'Forum of Appius' on the great south road stood alone as the precursor of a number of similar market centres established as nascent cities by the road-makers of the second and later centuries. Town life in non-Roman Italy was mainly developed in such regions as Etruria, Umbria, Campania and the Greek cities of the southern coasts (to which we may add the isolated Greek community of Ancona, in the north-west). On the Adriatic slope and its adjacent plains in the south-west allied towns of importance were far apart, Arpi and Canusium in Apulia being among the most noteworthy. These districts were in the possession of tribes akin to the Illyrian folk beyond the Adriatic, who would have fallen under the domination of the Samnite and Lucanian mountaineers had these not succumbed to Rome.

Of the tribal organizations, more or less closely knit, whom Rome admitted to her



ROME'S GREAT ADRIATIC SEAPORT: BRUNDISIUM AS IT IS TO-DAY

Brundisium was colonised by the Romans in 245 B.C., in the first instance as a southern outpost for Roman control of the peninsula, and afterwards developed as a naval base on the Adriatic. After the Punic Wars it became the chief port of embarkation for Greece and the East. It was connected with Rome by the Appian Way, and two antique columns by the quay, one of which is seen in this photograph, are said to mark the termination of that military highway.

*Photo, E.N.A.*

alliance, the Gallic cantons in the north were regarded even by Polybius as being on a lower plane of civilization than their southern neighbours, and though the friendly relations of Rome with the Cenomani prove that she had no idea of excluding the Celts from the pale, the wonderful story of the Romanisation of the regions which are now Piedmont, Lombardy and Venetia was yet to be written. It was otherwise with the Ligurian tribes with whom Rome was brought into contact during the Gallic war. The list of triumphs registers three victories won at their expense in the decade 233-223 B.C.; but for the time being the object aimed at was no more than to secure the coast and the passes over the Apennines, and we are merely told that this ancient people was 'pushed back into the Alps' (i.e. the Apuan Alps); their brutal treatment by triumph-hunting commanders belongs to a later phase of Roman history.

Among the branches of the Italic stock which retained their tribal organization we should distinguish the hardy peasant democracies of the Abruzzi—Marsi, Paeligni, Vestini, Marrucini, Frentani—which had no far-reaching ambitions and were respected and conciliated by Rome, from the larger and more aggressive aggregates such as the Samnites and Lucanians. In the independent Italic tribal organizations 'toe' of the Italian peninsula the Bruttii formed a loose confederation of this sort; they are said to have entered into some form of alliance with Rome after the submission of Tarentum, but there seems to have been little interference with their affairs, and they continued to strike coins when this privilege was denied to the other confederates; but they were a backward people, and were late in submitting to civilizing influences. Of the 'Illyrian' tribes in the 'heel' little need be said. Greek influences had prepared them to take their place with the more civilized stocks; and it is well to remember that Ennius, the first to introduce into Roman literature the form of epic of which Vergil was one day to be the master, was born in this region, and was growing to manhood when Hannibal crossed the Alps.

To those who seek the causes of Rome's rise to greatness the preceding narrative will have furnished indications of the answer to their question; but some recapitulation is needed in order to give the true historical perspective.

Livy, in recording the debate which is said to have been held after the fall of Veii on the question whether the Romans should migrate to the site of the conquered city, puts into the mouth of Camillus words which no doubt expressed the view of his own contemporaries:

*Mistress not slave of circumstances*

Not without reason did gods and men choose this spot for the founding of a city, with its healthy hills, its river so well placed for the conveyance of the fruits of the earth from the regions of the interior and for the receipt of supplies from overseas, near enough to the sea for convenience, but not so close as to be exposed to peril from an enemy's fleet, a central position in Italy—in a word, a site destined above all others for the growth and increase of a city.

It is no doubt true that Rome was a natural and defensible bridge-head, and as such was (as we saw) occupied by the Etruscans; and it is also true that her central position gave her a strategical advantage in that she could act on interior lines against her enemies, if a combined attack were made upon her. But she was hardly better placed for trade than, say, Caere or Capua; and it was rather the genius of her people, partly expressed in her institutions, and partly revealing itself in the intensely practical sense which made her quick to seize opportunities, to exploit advantages and to distinguish the essential from the irrelevant in matters of policy, to which her rise to greatness was due. She was throughout not the slave but the mistress of circumstances.

The political institutions of Rome will be discussed in Chapters 55 and 62. Here we have only to show how, throughout her history, she was (in the Latin phrase) 'faber fortunae suae'—the artificer of her own fortune. The Etruscan princes made her no mean city, brought her into touch with the more advanced culture of the East, and established her military power. But her inhabitants came of a stock which could not, like the primitive population of Etruria, remain in serfdom under a

ruling minority of alien race. They threw off the yoke, having learnt what was needed to make them the leaders of their own Latin race. Having attained to that position, the Romans entered into close relations with that branch of the Italic stock—the Campanians—which had progressed further than the rest in the same direction as themselves and was in close touch with Greek culture. They knew what to take and what to give. When the growth of commerce made it necessary to have a silver coinage, they set up a mint in Capua where coins were struck in the name of Rome, but in a style derived from Greece. On the other hand, they could afford protection by their military strength to the plainsmen against the mountaineers.


Then came the contest with Samnium, in which the Romans recognized (as they had done before in the war with Veii) a vital issue. Livy may be writing as a rhetorician, but he probably expresses a view of the struggle consciously or subconsciously present to the minds of the Roman statesmen, when he puts into the mouth of a Samnite envoy the words :

Our dispute is not to be settled by the parleyings of envoys or by the discussions of individuals, but on the plains of Campania,

in which the clash of arms must come, and by the impartial decree of the war god. Let us join battle, army with army, and decide whether the Roman or the Samnite is to rule Italy by his authority.

The victory of Rome in this contest brought her directly into contact with the Greeks. From the Greek cities she had nothing to fear. With post-Alexandrian monarchy, however, as personified in Pyrrhus, a fight to a finish was once again necessary, and was carried through. Rome was now a world power. There is no need to repeat what was said above of her policy and diplomacy; but her sound business sense may be illustrated by the fact that one of her first steps after the war was to set up the 'denarius' as the standard coin of Italy.

The Roman had no genius for science, or art, or religion. In all these spheres individual brilliance is responsible for the most memorable achievements; and the Roman was not individually brilliant. The great deeds of the Romans were done by average men. But these average men were capable of intense practical concentration; and concentration effects what genius cannot compass, if indeed it be not itself, in the wider sense, genius.



#### EVIDENCE FROM COINS OF ROME'S GROWING POWER AND COMMERCE.

Roman coinage was instituted about 338 B.C. when a mint was set up at Capua, where coins were struck in the name of Rome. These included silver didrachms and litrae, and bronze unciæ and other bronze tokens. The designs were various, but all the earlier Campanian coins bore the word 'Romano' on the obverse. In 260-8 B.C. a new coinage was introduced, and to this the silver denarius with the head of Roma on the obverse belongs. This imperial denarius subsequently became the standard coin throughout the Mediterranean world.

British Museum; from Hull, 'Historical Roman Coins'

# THE CARTHAGINIANS AND THEIR MARITIME EMPIRE

Life in the powerful Merchant City of North Africa that fought with Rome for the Mastery of the Mediterranean

By F. N. PRYCE

Assistant Keeper of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum

OUR knowledge of the Carthaginians and their civilization comes to us through channels which can only be described as thoroughly unsatisfactory. For Egypt, Assyria and the other nations of antiquity we have their own records, often sadly fragmentary, it is true; but Carthage in this respect is entirely mute. We are dependent on stray paragraphs by Greek or Roman historians utterly hostile in sentiment to Carthage, who cannot say enough to blacken her. We can see that there must have been another side to their story—the two leaders of the Greeks against her, Dionysius and Agathocles, were both great scoundrels, and it is plain to the eye that in the long-drawn struggle of the Punic wars with Rome Carthage was more sinned against than sinning—but the material for reconstructing this other side is entirely lacking.

Even more misleading than their anti-Carthaginian bias is the ignorance of these historians; few had any first-hand knowledge of Carthage, or any interest in her customs and institutions; and hence such meagre details as they give us are open to question. Common to most is a tendency to exaggerate the size and wealth of Carthage and its resources as a fighting power. At no time was Carthage a fair match for Rome; and later Roman historians patriotically concealed the gross blunders which prolonged the wars and magnified the final triumph of their country by pretending that Carthage was twice as powerful as she really was. The Carthaginians could not contradict.

When we pass from written history to the remains of Carthaginian civilization,

to the results of exploration and the objects preserved in our museums, we find the position equally unsatisfactory. It is often remarked that no nation has left behind so little trace of its existence as the Phoenician, a fact easily understood when we consider the circumstances of their existence as a people. Their native land was a narrow strip of the coast of Syria, hemmed in between the Lebanon and the sea; and they never could have numbered more than a very few hundred thousands. Impelled probably by sheer pressure of overcrowding in their cramped homeland, they sought to gain a livelihood by trading with less advanced peoples, settling for that purpose in conveniently placed little islands or peninsulas, where they provoked less jealousy than if they had chosen sites on the mainland, and where they could defend themselves more advantageously.

In these narrow quarters their status was similar to that of Europeans in Chinese concessions, save that they had no help to look for in the event of trouble. Hence when quarrels with the natives or foreign competition pressed them, they simply abandoned the settlements and moved elsewhere. They could fight, and fight stubbornly, if driven to the wall, but they were as a nation too conscious of their numerical inferiority to court war; it was better business to cut losses and begin again elsewhere. Add to this that they lacked the ability or the opportunity to produce a distinctive national art, but were content with commercial reproductions of the styles and ornaments fashion-

Character of the  
Phoenicians

able among their more powerful neighbours, and we need not wonder that they have left few remains behind them.

With the Phoenicians of the western half of the Mediterranean, the Carthaginians who are the object of our study, the case is somewhat different. Their settlements were placed among poor and savage nations, farther removed from their worst competitors, the Greeks. Carthage itself, owing to its favoured situation at one of the key points of Mediterranean commerce, grew to unusual size and prosperity, and was thus enabled to assume a measure of control over its sister cities and to unite their resources into a loose confederacy, strong enough to keep out the Greeks almost entirely, and for a time to hold its ground against Rome.

The settlements thus had a stable existence of some centuries, and the result is that a much larger amount of material has been recovered from them by excavation than from Phoenician sites in the east.

Many more Phoenician inscriptions, for example, are known from Carthaginian sites than from the homeland of Phoenicia itself. Yet if the material is more abundant, it is thoroughly disappointing. A single Egyptian or Etruscan tomb can throw a flood of light upon its age; we can dig up an entire Carthaginian cemetery and find nothing but a mass of coarse factory-made products from which we can glean as little information as will the archaeologist of the future from the rubbish heaps of sardine-tins and safety-razor blades which will be available to reconstruct the culture of the present enlightened age.

Both written history and material remains, then, give us scanty assistance in the task of conjuring up an image of Carthage in her prime. It is not even certain at what point in her long history that prime is to be placed. Some writers have thought Carthage degenerated after 400 B.C. They point out that the numbers



**CARTHAGE : THE BYRSA HEIGHT AS IT IS TO-DAY**

Situated on a promontory at the north-west angle of the Bay of Tunis, Carthage occupied a key position on the Mediterranean in ancient times. To-day its site is being developed as a suburb of Tunis, ten miles away, the location and climate being ideal for Europeans. The ancient Byrsa is represented now by the hill of St. Louis, where the Cathedral stands, and an electric railway runs along the shore from Tunis to Carthage station at the foot of the Byrsa height, and on to La Marsa.

*Photo, E.N.A.*








given for Carthaginian armies in the early wars are greater than at any other time and that objects of finer style are found in the early tombs. But all over the Mediterranean world style deteriorated in the fourth century B.C., and we shall presently show that the stories of early Carthaginian military prowess are untrue. It seems more probable that Carthage was never so rich and so prosperous as in the century preceding her downfall; and our description will refer to the period of the Punic Wars and to the city of half a century before and after 200 B.C. In its early days the city looked to Egypt for its fashions and culture, but at the age we have chosen Greek civilization was supreme throughout the Mediterranean; and the Phoenician capital was so thoroughly permeated with Greek art and manners that Greek writers could compare it with their own most renowned cities and declare that Carthage was as 'well built a city as Syracuse, Rhodes or Marseilles.'

The site, a promontory at the north-west angle of the Bay of Tunis, has been described in Chapter 38 (see pages 1177-78).

Here are the white villas of modern Carthage, a rapidly growing suburb of the city of Tunis which is distant half an hour's tram-ride; and among these the tourist is shown the ruins of Roman Carthage, for centuries one of the most important cities of the Mediterranean—

headquarters of a Roman proconsul, metropolis of Christian Africa, capital of the independent kingdom of the Vandals and seat of the Byzantine administration until in A.D. 698 the Arab invaders left it a desolate ruin. But where is the older Carthage, the city of Hannibal, the rival of Rome and the mistress of the Western Seas?

The guide-books unhesitatingly reply that the older Carthage covered the same



#### CARTHAGE AND ITS NEIGHBOURHOOD

At its zenith Carthage occupied the whole peninsula; a triple line of fortifications carried right across the isthmus defended it on the land side. The citadel and inner harbours were in the south-east corner. Utica, the older Phoenician settlement lay fifteen miles to the north-west.

site as the Roman city. The Hill of St. Louis, where now stands the Cathedral, must have been the Citadel, the 'Byrsa,' where in 146 B.C. the Carthaginians made their last stand. Various masses of ruins have from time to time been identified as belonging to the older city and its walls; and most striking of all are two pools, or lagoons, near the sea; one is round with an island in the centre, the other oblong (see photograph in page 1179). These at once recall to us the famous naval and commercial harbours, which will be presently described, and are usually considered to identify the site beyond question.

All this may be correct; but the ground has been fairly extensively explored during recent years, and the results have been disappointing. In the first place, the northern half of the site has been found to be crowded thick with Carthaginian cemeteries, a sound proof that the city could

not have extended thus far. Secondly, the various remains assigned to the Carthaginian city have been argued or proved to be of Roman date; some authorities even deny that the two lagoons in any way represent the old harbours; other interpretations of the old descriptions and other locations have been proposed, while excavations on the island were inconclusive, as usual. We are thus left with the fact that no indisputable trace of the old city has been brought to light, and one or two recent writers have even gone so far as to question the accuracy of the tradition that the Carthaginian city stood on this spot.

On the other hand, it may be argued that the absence of remains is precisely what is to be expected; are we not told that the Romans left no two stones of the city standing? And any material lying about would have been used in building the Roman city just as this in its turn formed the quarry from which Tunis was built. Add that Roman Carthage itself had a long and chequered history and that the burnt layers and foundations, in which some have seen traces of the older city, may equally well be of early Roman date, and it will be realized that the site is a thoroughly perplexing problem. Still, if no point of the old city can at present be identified with certainty, that it stood hereabouts, in close proximity to its cemeteries, is not disputed; and the first point to observe is that it was by no means so large a place as some historians have suggested.

One ancient author informs us that before its destruction Carthage had a population of 700,000. Now we have seen that the city could not have

**Estimates of the population** extended over the northern half of the Roman site; and it is calculated that its maximum area was not more than 550 acres—some writers would bring this figure down to half—and we must make a large deduction for the harbours, etc. Shore-ditch with 650 acres and Bethnal Green with 750 have each about 120,000 inhabitants; and admitting that Carthage packed its population more tightly than the East End of London, a figure of about 150,000 seems the highest possible. And other evidence supports this view; to give one

instance, when the Romans finally stormed the town, all the non-combatants who could get away took refuge in the Citadel—50,000 of them. Allowing for the casualties of the siege, this is not an unreasonable proportion for our total. The figure of 700,000 must be either regarded as the population of the whole countryside, or—much more likely—dismissed as an ignorant exaggeration.

The entire peninsula appears to have been surrounded by a wall which ran close to the sea. On the land side was a more elaborate fortification, the 'Triple Walls,' **Fortifications of the Peninsula** which probably consisted of a ditch with palisade, an outer wall and a larger main wall, forty-five feet high with towers set at intervals of sixty yards. This is an old and widespread system of defence; the walls of Constantinople, built several centuries later, are the best example still in existence. Within the thickness of the main wall was stabling for 400 war-elephants and above this another floor to hold 4,000 horses. Close at hand were barracks for the riders and for 20,000 infantry.

Where it came down to the city, the sea wall was set back from the water to leave space for a broad quay, the Choma; here the merchant vessels unloaded their cargoes and the caravans from the interior deposited their wares. But the pride of Carthage was the great artificial harbour excavated within the wall in the heart of the city, and approached by a channel only seventy feet wide which could be closed by a chain in time of war. This passage led to the Mercantile Harbour, a vast oblong 1,400 feet long and nearly 1,100 broad, surrounded by quays and warehouses. At the farther end another channel provided ingress to the inner harbour, the Cothon, which was reserved for ships of war.

This was of circular form, nearly 1,100 feet in diameter, and around it were docks to hold 220 warships; in front of each dock stood marble pillars of the Ionic order, so that the whole presented the appearance of a superb circular portico. In the centre was an island on which stood the palace of the admiral, a lofty tower overtopping the city wall.

Here the officer of the watch, his trumpeter at hand to sound the alarm, could survey the busy movement of shipping; the fishing-boats scattered over the blue waters of the Gulf of Tunis; the war-galleys, long and narrow, bright with scarlet and gilding, tossing up the foam with the rhythmical beat of their oars; the stately ships of Tarshish raising their big, bellying sails and slowly shaping their course for the Western Ocean, or perhaps crawling home again around the cape, battered and weather-beaten, with rich booty in their holds—silver from Spain, tin from the far-off Cassiterides or gold dust from Africa—and with strange stories of new-found lands and wild beings 'whose bodies were hairy and whom our interpreters called gorillas.'

Adjoining the Cothon was the market-place, a large square surrounded by colonnades in which public banquets were held, and set around with masterpieces of Greek sculpture pillaged from captured cities of Sicily. Arranged about the square were the law-courts and other state offices; and here also was a famous temple of Apollo, covered with plates of beaten gold and containing a mighty statue of the god which Roman soldiers were later to carry off to Rome. All this reads very much like a Greek city of the period; the geometrical plan of the harbours, the grouping of the public buildings, all remind us of the Greek fashion of ordered town-planning which grew prevalent after the time of Alexander the Great. The whole area must have



#### ILLUMINATING STUDIES OF FACIAL TYPES AND FASHIONS

Numerous terra-cotta objects found on the site of Carthage, though of rough workmanship, are valuable illustrations of facial types and of costumes. These specimens show (above) the masculine mode of wearing the beard long while shaving the upper lip, and (below) the curtain-veiled head-dress affected by women; also the ugly fashion adopted by both sexes of wearing a nose ring. The figure on the right shows the long, full robe worn by women of the middle class.

From 'Musée Lavigerie' and 'Musée Alcazar,' E. Laroux, Paris

been laid out some time in the third century B.C., probably by a Greek architect, certainly under Greek inspiration; and we shall not be far wrong in mentally restoring these splendid colonnades and buildings with the forms and details familiar from Greek architecture of the period.

But behind this magnificent façade the inner part of the town remained purely Phoenician. Three streets led up to the citadel, streets so narrow that a plank could be thrown across from roof to roof. On either side stone houses rose six storeys or more in height—flat-roofed, sometimes with bay-windows closed by wooden lattices to catch the breeze. Within them men crowded like ants, often whole families in a single room, sleeping on the floor, their only household goods a few pots and pans, one or two boxes and a bundle of rugs—such to-day is deemed sufficient furniture in the Orient. Wealthy families would have vases and paintings brought from Greece, Etruscan bronzes, tapestries and purple hangings from Tyre; but, likely enough, they too lived in cramped quarters. It is noteworthy that the Carthaginian aristocracy spent as much time as possible in the country away from the city.

In these narrow streets and the side-alleys the sun was shut out and the smells were kept in. Of all

**Life in the crowded streets** the nations of antiquity only Rome, and possibly Crete, showed the rudiments of a sense of sanitation, and Carthage was repeatedly swept by horrible plagues. The water supply was also defective, though we read of public baths, doubtless of the Turkish pattern, some of which were furnished with much luxury and reserved for the exclusive use of the upper classes. A medley of



#### IN GREEK ATTIRE

This female figure in Greek costume was probably executed in Carthage, but is pure Greek in style. It was carved in high relief for a sarcophagus.

From 'Musée Lacgoria'

all nations filled the ways—Carthaginians, Phoenicians from all parts of the Mediterranean, Berbers from North Africa, negroes from the Sudan, Egyptians, Spaniards, red-haired Gauls. Greeks were numerous, and the Greek language was widely used; there was a colony of Italians who were massacred by the infuriated populace at the outbreak of the third Punic War.

The Carthaginians wore the hair short and the beard long and often pointed; the upper lip was not infrequently shaved. Such portraits as remain do not show a very prepossessing type of countenance. Men's dress consisted of shoes or sandals, a conical cap not unlike the modern fez, or more rarely a turban, and a long, loose gown with sleeves. It was a favourite Roman jest that the Carthaginians went about in bathrobes, this being the impression produced by their flowing garments in comparison with the heavy folds of the Roman toga. Men and

women alike were addicted to the use of perfumes, and both sexes had a passion for jewelry; even the ugly habit of wearing a nose ring was common. Women wore a long gown and a veil over the head; the richer classes dressed in the Greek style. We hear little about the women, which suggests that, in Oriental fashion, they were confined to the harem. Husbands do not appear to have associated with their wives in religious worship. On the other hand, it is known that women of high family filled important offices in the priesthood.


Whether polygamy was permitted or not is unknown, but it must have been very rare, to judge by the number of tombs containing the remains of husband and wife. The sentiment of family was strongly felt; men loved to enumerate their ancestors on inscriptions. Morally



#### FINEST EXTANT MONUMENTS OF CARTHAGINIAN CULTURE

This figure (left) from the lid of a sarcophagus that contained the remains of a priestess, is the finest extant representation of the Carthaginian Tanit-Astarte. The goddess—or priestess in the guise of the goddess—wears a long tunic, a scarf of gold-edged material over her shoulders, vulture's wings folded round her body and the vulture head-dress of the Egyptian goddess Nebhat (Nephthys). The workmanship of this really beautiful figure is Greek. Hellenic influence appears also in the imposing figure (right) of a bearded man, seemingly a priest, from another sarcophagus.

*From 'Musée Louvrique,' E. Leroux, Paris*



#### PIOUS TRIBUTE TO THE GREAT GODS

These votive stelae are both dedicated 'to the great Tanit-Fene-Baal and to the lord Baal-Haman,' the two chief divinities in Carthaginian religion. That on the left must have belonged to a great family, for the inscription shows that both the father and grandfather of the dedicator were Suffetes.

*From 'Musée Louvrière,' E. Leroux, Paris*

the city had as bad a name as could be, but accusations of this kind are too common to be accepted at their face value. We constantly read of the Carthaginians as heavy eaters, heavy drinkers and evil livers, and undoubtedly their religion was not free from most objectionable practices; but we may doubt whether the Greeks and Romans who reproach them were very greatly superior.

The language is akin to the Hebrew and was written in the Phoenician script without vowels or division between the words. Many inscriptions have been found, but unfortunately most of them contain little more than proper names or ritual formulas. The Carthaginians were fond of recording events, and there is evidence that they had some kind of a literature and libraries; but all has perished, save an account of a voyage to

tropical Africa and part of an encyclopaedia of farming, which are known to us in translations. The language long survived the city and only died out when the Mahomedan invaders introduced a kindred speech, Arabic, the tongue of the country to-day.

The streets were bordered by shops—open cells in which artisans laboured and the owners sat cross-legged and bargained endlessly with their customers. All the varied needs of a great city called to be supplied, and we need not doubt that the various trades were grouped together in bazaars after the time-immemorial custom of the Orient. Yet, to judge from extant remains, we cannot rank the Carthaginian craftsman at a high level. It is a singular fact that whenever any piece of outstanding merit is found, it proves to be of foreign workmanship. Throughout the history of the city the Carthaginian showed no originality; at the beginning he copied from Egypt; later he took his models from Greece; nor

was he a good copyist.

Carthage was full of statues—Greek statues; what the Carthaginian sculptor could do, we know from the miserable work on the votive tablets we shall presently describe. Pottery was extensively manufactured; kilns have been found among the cemeteries which supplied the vases buried in the graves. There is literally nothing to be said about it, it is all just plain kitchen earthenware. The most pleasing objects that have survived to us are the little terra-cotta statuettes; but they are all adapted from Greek models, and, set alongside a Greek figurine, they show a heavy fleshiness that is characteristically Phoenician. Jewelry was extensively made and worn; it was all a tasteless copy of Greek patterns. Of perishable objects such as textiles, which have not survived to us, there was no doubt a large

production, but here again the Greeks were superior. It was in a robe made by Greek hands and for which the Carthaginians paid 120 talents (£28,000) that the image of the great goddess Tanit was draped.

Above the streets rose the Byrsa, the Citadel, enclosed by great walls, the strongest point of the whole city. Here were the Treasury and the Mint, and on the highest point in the midst of colonnades rose the most splendid temple of all, that of Eshmun. A superb



#### RECUMBENT FIGURES FROM CARTHAGINIAN SARCOPHAGI

Wealthy Carthaginians were embalmed after death and laid in stone or marble sarcophagi, often bearing on the lid a figure of the deceased person. The Punic inscription on the sarcophagus above tells us that the bearded figure (right) was 'Baalsillec the Rab,' princely member of one of the great Councils of Carthage. He wears the pectoral in the form of a Maltese cross and holds a casket against his chest. The figure (left) from another sarcophagus was probably of the same rank.

*From 'Musée Lavigerie,' E. Leroux, Paris*





#### CORPULENCE OPPOSED TO GRACE

Carthaginian potters adopted Greek models, but, as shown by this comparison of a figure of a priestess from Sardinia (left) with an analogous Greek figurine from Rhodes, their work showed a heavy fleshiness characteristically Phoenician.

*British Museum*

flight of sixty steps led to this building, which must have towered over the city as the Parthenon over Athens. Other temples abounded, many of them dedicated to foreign gods, for the Carthaginians were not intolerant. In 396 B.C. an army in Sicily suffered great calamities which were attributed to the wrath of the Greek goddesses Demeter and Persephone, whose shrine had been pillaged. To appease the deities, the senate of Carthage built a great temple to them and made the Greeks resident in the city responsible for directing that the worship should be carried on in the traditional Greek manner as the goddesses were accustomed to receive it. Similarly there are abundant traces of Osiris, Isis and the other gods of Egypt.

But these foreign cults affected the religion of the common people as little as the present Cathedral influences the surrounding Mahomedan population. Not to the strange gods in their stately temples,

but to the old nature deities brought from Phoenicia, in tiny shrines and holy places, the Carthaginians to the end paid their reverence. The Semitic peoples seem to lack that impulse which led the Western nations to build cathedrals—the Temple at Jerusalem is an apparent exception, but this like the temples at Carthage may have been due to foreign influence. The Semite is apt to consider any temporary tabernacle or rude shed a fit dwelling for his god—often a tree or an upright stone is enough to mark the divine habitation. A shrine has recently been found at Carthage and others are known from other sites. They are small, plain rectangular enclosures, containing no statue or idol—to make graven images of the gods was a foreign innovation unknown to the earliest Phoenicians—but crowded thick with upright stone slabs, like tombstones, dedicated to the deity. Such is the normal Phoenician place of worship.


Carthaginian religion is a complicated study in detail owing to the foreign ideas and deities which were freely grafted upon it in the course of centuries, but the main lines are clear. The Carthaginians brought from Phoenicia the old dual worship of which traces are found everywhere—the male and female principles of nature, the Sun and Moon in heaven. Baal-Moloch and Astarte were the Phoenician names for these powers, but throughout the Carthaginian sphere they were revered under the names of Baal-Haman and Tanit-Pene-Baal, 'Tanit who is the Face of Baal'; and it is a curious point that, while everywhere else the sun god had the precedence, in the city of Carthage itself the moon goddess, Tanit-Pene-Baal, took the first place.

**Gods of the Carthaginians**

The reasons for this escape us, but Tanit seems to have been originally the moon goddess of the native African tribes; the Carthaginians would promptly have identified her with Astarte, and may then have given her especial honour to placate the natives. Although Tanit in all respects corresponds to Astarte, there was a separate cult of the latter goddess; it seems that the original worship was still kept up, or it may have been re-introduced by a fresh batch of colonists

direct from Phoenicia. Another explanation, that Astarte was the crescent moon, the virgin goddess, and Tanit the full moon, the symbol of motherhood, is probably less correct; Tanit certainly included both ideas. Her symbol is found again and again—a circle above a triangle, with a bar between; in later times this was thought to be a rude representation of the human form, but its original significance appears to be the moon on an altar.


Tanit-Astarte is represented under many forms, very commonly as a nude woman standing with the hands pressing the breasts in token of fertility; but this, curiously enough, does not appear to have been found in Carthage itself. The Carthaginian type is best illustrated from a figure on the lid of a sarcophagus found a few years ago. This is sometimes described as a priestess, and



GOLD EAR-RINGS FOR FASHIONABLE WOMEN

Jewelry was extensively worn by both sexes in Carthage and women had wide choice in ear-rings. These were made in many shapes and in one or more pieces, joined together by rings. Basket pendants with grain in them (left) seem to have been popular, and birds and animals' heads often appear.

*British Museum*



GREEK HANDIWORK FOR COMPARISON

Carthaginian jewelry was a tasteless copy of Greek patterns. Something of its indebtedness and inferiority can be seen by comparing the Carthaginian ear-rings in the upper photograph with this Greek plaque (left), and especially with the Greek ornament (right) from Eretria with shells pendent from a richly decorated crescent

*British Museum*

certainly a priestess was buried beneath; but it is no portrait, for inside was found the skull of a toothless old woman; it is an ideal portrayal of the priestess as representing the goddess herself. She stands richly robed in red, blue, pink and gold; in her hands a dove and an incense box; two great vulture wings fold round her body and on her head is the vulture head-dress of the Egyptian goddess Nephthys; an Egyptian veil falls down on each shoulder. Egyptian in the dress, Greek in the workmanship and in the sweet dignity of expression, this monument might serve as a type of the mixed character of Carthaginian civilization; it is the finest thing

Carthage has handed down to us (see illustration in page 1619). Alone amongst the masses of dull rubbish hitherto found, it permits us to think for an instant of the over-florid dreams of Flaubert's *Salammbô*.

Second to Tanit-Pene-Baal in Carthage, but supreme elsewhere in the Carthaginian Empire, came the sun god, Baal-Haman; the name is variously interpreted to mean either 'Lord of Heat' or more probably 'Lord of the Stone Pillars,' a signification which takes us back to a very primitive stratum of religious thought; as when Jacob set up a stone and called it Beth-el, the House of God. Like Tanit, Baal-Haman was a compound deity, blended of the original sun god and an African deity, Ammon, whom we have met in

Egypt as Amen-Ra. In his case we are not fortunate enough to possess a masterpiece of sculpture to which we can refer for the Carthaginian type, but some small terra-cotta statuettes are commonly thought to represent him—they show a heavily bearded, heavily robed man with ram's horns projecting from his head, seated on a stately throne.

Some writers have imagined that the gods of Carthage were grouped in threes and have wished to form a trinity of greater gods by adding to the Sun and Moon Eshmun, the master and protector of the city; but the evidence for such trinities is very doubtful and of Eshmun we really only know that he bestowed wealth and health—the name comes from a root meaning 'to be fat.' But there is



MEMORIALS OF PUNIC PIETY IN THE PRECINCT OF TANIT

Excavations begun in 1922 resulted in the discovery, a little to the west of the Mercantile Harbour, of part of the precincts of the Sanctuary of Tanit. The finds comprised cinerary urns and hundreds of dedicatory stones. These latter are set close together in the earth like tombstones in a modern cemetery and are of three types: altar-like shrine stones bearing various symbols of Tanit (right); inscribed stelae, some of them being small rectangular pillars; and large ovoid pebbles.

*Photo (right), F. W. Kelsey, 'Excavations at Carthage,' American Journal of Archaeology*

no doubt that Tanit-Pene-Baal and Baal-Haman reigned supreme in popular devotion; in most inscriptions they alone appear; the numerous other gods (nature deities—'baalim,' or 'lords') are usually ignored, and we may abstain from discussing them here, all the more as they seem to have been in the main simply variations of the two great deities. Mention must be made however of one, Melkarth, who originally was the form of sun god worshipped at Tyre, but who in time came to be regarded as an emblem of the national unity of the scattered Phoenician race. No sacrifices were made to him, but every year a ship was sent laden with costly offerings for his temple in the mother city.



SPHINX-SHAPED RITUAL WINE VESSEL

Representations of the Egyptian sphinx are found in Carthaginian art. A quaint variant of it in the form of a gryphon appears in this earthenware vessel, possibly intended for ritual use; the wine was poured into the vessel through a hole in the creature's back and poured out through the spout in the breast.

*Musée Lavigerie*



BAAL-HAMAN : TERRIBLE GOD DELIGHTING IN HUMAN SACRIFICE

Although supreme elsewhere in the Carthaginian Empire, Baal-Haman ranked second to Tanit in Carthage itself. He was a blend of the original sun god and the African deity Ammon, known in Egypt as Amen-Ra. Baal-Haman was figured as a bearded man in the prime of life seated on a stately throne (right). Some terra-cotta statuettes represent him with ram's horns projecting from his head (left) and with the arms of his throne carved in the shape of horns.

*From 'Parrot at Chipiez,' 'L'art en Phénicie,' and 'Musée Lavigerie,' E. Laroux, Paris*

The cult of the sun and moon was widespread in antiquity and in modern Britain many practices and beliefs linger in public superstition which can be directly connected up with it. The crescent rolls on the breakfast table—what are they but the survivals of the cakes baked for the Queen of Heaven? The wish-bone of a chicken, the lucky eyelash lying curled on the palm of the hand, the horse-shoe nailed up for luck, these are only a few of the crescent shapes that bring the favour of the moon goddess. The midsummer bonfires are still lit in remote country districts, and boys jump through the smoke without thinking that they mimic the rites with which Baal was once worshipped in the Valley of Hinnom.

But the worship of nature powers is ever prone to sink into degradation and immorality, and at Carthage it appeared in sombre colours. Tanit was not only the goddess of wedded love and of motherhood, who gave increase to the flocks and harvest to the field; she was




**THE MOON GODDESS**

As symbolising motherhood the Phoenician moon goddess was often—though rarely in Carthage—represented naked, with hands pressing the breasts in token of fertility.

*British Museum*

also the patroness of all the 'abominations of the Sidonians' so fiercely denounced in the Old Testament. Baal-Haman the Romans aptly compared to Father Time who devoured his own children, for to him was given the horrid tribute of first-born infants. In times of danger two or three hundred, chosen from the noblest families, would be sacrificed in a day; for Baal-Haman was a jealous god and the proudest blood of the city was needed to placate him. The mothers had to stand by tearless and uncomplaining as their little ones were placed on the outstretched arms of the idol, to roll off into the blazing fire beneath, while cymbals and trumpets drowned the screams. In an excavated holy place have been found traces of such sacrifices—pottery urns containing the charred remains of babies. We must remember that at this period no country, not even Rome, was entirely free from the taint of human sacrifice, but our authorities unite in giving Carthage an evil name and it seems that an ugly



**ASHES OF HUMAN SACRIFICE IN CARTHAGINIAN CINERARY URNS**

The predominant type of cinerary urn unearthed in the precinct of Tanit was the clay amphora with ovoid body, outplayed neck and clay stopper. The earliest in date were found resting on the bed rock, each protected by a small cairn of stones (right). In some of the urns calcined bones of little children were found, most probably the remains of infants 'passed through the fire' as living human sacrifices to the awful Baal-Haman.

*Photos, Kuhn de Prorok and Kelsey, 'Excavations at Carthage'*

vein of fanaticism was never far from the surface with them. Prisoners of war were often sacrificed wholesale by way of thank-offering for a victory.

At the battle of Himera in 480 B.C., while the armies were locked in combat, the Carthaginian general stood apart on the hillside offering burnt sacrifices to win the favour of the god, while all around stood priests muttering their incantations. Victim after victim perished and still the god hearkened not; the Carthaginian ranks began to break, whereupon in a last desperate effort to win the victory for his country the general flung himself into the furnace as the supreme offering.

Priests, divided into numerous grades, formed an extensive section of the population; the office, in some cases at least, descended from father to son, but we are not certain that there was a special



#### PHOENICIAN CHARMS AND AMULETS

All Carthaginians wore amulets against the evil eye. The rectangular charms above came from Tharros; the rest from Cyprus. Egyptian influence is manifest in these, notably in the ape god and hawk god (top right and bottom left). The charm (bottom right) represents the sacred eye of Osiris.

*British Museum*

priestly class, like the Levites. Women were freely admitted for the cults of the female deities. The portraits of several priests are known from sarcophagi—bearded men in long robes, with a stole over the left shoulder, generally holding an incense box. Divination by omens was common, as with the Romans, and affairs of state were determined by the last quiver of a dying victim. Amulets and charms against the evil eye were worn on the person; in brief, the Carthaginians appear as a thoroughly superstitious people.

The Romans accused them of cheating their gods, of not fulfilling the vows they made in the hope of winning favour; but the Romans themselves were not altogether guiltless of this practice, and every Carthaginian holy place so far known is crowded with offerings to the gods in fulfilment of vows. At the same time, it must be said that the objects dedicated show neither beauty of design nor costliness of material. They are pieces of limestone, sometimes in the



#### IMITATION EGYPTIAN COFFIN LIDS

Funerary statuettes resembling mummies are notable illustrations of Egyptian influence on Carthaginian practices with regard to the disposal of the dead. Of the specimens above that on the left was originally painted black and red; the others have the eye of Osiris painted on the shoulders.

*From 'Musée Lavigieri,' E. Leroux*

form of an altar, more often resembling a tombstone; carelessly carved on the front are a few divine symbols and a few words of inscription. On the example given in page 1620 (left) we see a Tanit symbol with a crescent and full moon above, a caduceus or magic rod at each side; below, we read: 'To the Lady Tanit-Pene-Baal and to the Lord Baal-Haman, Safat, that son of Adonibaal the Suffete, son of Hamilcar the Suffete, fulfils his vow because his prayer has been answered.' The Suffete being the highest rank in Carthage, we can imagine the worth of the offerings of poorer persons when this wretched slab was thought good enough for a descendant of nobles. Thousands of these votive reliefs are known, all alike in principle. It has been a weary disappointment to scholars to wade through the inscriptions and to find nothing but long strings

of names; only on the rarest occasions is there any hint which throws light upon the civilization and manners of the age.


The customs observed in disposing of the dead varied at different times; cremation was at one period in favour, but inhumation was the more usual practice. Young children were never burnt, but buried in clay pots packed tightly together a few inches underground (for which reason we conclude that the charred remains of babies previously referred to are the traces of sacrifices). The graves of adults were usually deep trenches, but a more elaborate form, derived from Egypt, is also found, consisting of a deep shaft at the bottom of which opens a vault. Coffins were in common use; the rich were embalmed in a resinous liquid and placed in stone or marble sarcophagi; some illustrations of these,



#### HOW AN UNEMOTIONAL PEOPLE PROVIDED FOR THEIR DEAD

These cheap terra-cotta articles found in tombs show the business-like temper in which the Carthaginians provided for the possible needs of their friends in the spirit world. The mask (top centre) was intended to scare away evil spirits; on its left is an incense burner, here inverted owing to its broken base, and on its right a Phoenician lamp—a saucer with edge pinched up to hold a little oil. Below are a wine bottle and vessels shaped like a bird and an ape to hold food and drink

*British Museum*



## EARLY PHOENICIAN BRONZE RAZORS

Bronze razors with long hatchet blades engraved in Egyptian style have been found in tombs at Carthage and elsewhere. The right-hand specimen here has a god with caduceus on one side and on the reverse a woman and child in attitude of adoration—a design reproduced on the other specimen.

*From 'Musée Alaoui,' E. Leroux*

showing a Greek type of figure, have been given; another style, more common in the eastern Mediterranean, imitates the Egyptian coffin-lid.


With the body were buried various articles: some vases with food and drink, a lamp of the usual Phoenician type (a pinched-up saucer resembling a shell—the wick floated on the surface of the oil); toilet implements and sometimes jewelry; or a grotesque human mask of clay, to frighten away evil spirits. These objects indicate a belief in survival after death; but they also illustrate the crass materialism of the Carthaginian mind. Unlike the Egyptians or Etruscans, who placed the most beautiful vases, the most precious furniture, in the tomb of a loved one, they thought the coarsest earthenware, or tawdry, tinfoil jewelry, good enough to be buried with their dead. Care was taken to inter a corpse quickly, provided with a meal to keep it quiet in the next world, or the

spirit would 'walk'; and, this attended to, little more heed was given to the dead. Even epitaphs are rare and when found give only the bare name; never a word of regret or farewell. The Carthaginians were too busy with this life to be sentimental about the next.

The earlier tombs occasionally contain articles of better quality, among which we may mention some curious bronze razors engraved with figures in the Egyptian style. It is interesting to observe that this shape of razor is still found in central Africa.

A belt of cemeteries bordered the town, and beyond it the peninsula was covered with orchards, gardens, and white-walled summer houses set within hedged enclosures.

Farther out the mainland was set thick with little agricultural villages inhabited by Libyans. Here were the estates of the Carthaginian nobility; for while Carthage rose to wealth by commerce and honoured it above all other ancient states, the upper classes in course of time tended to dissociate themselves from trade and to assume the characteristics of a landed gentry, a



## MINIATURE CHAIRS FOR SPIRITUAL ABODES

Although the Carthaginians had some belief in an after-life they were too practical to waste valuable material articles on spiritual beings. Thus instead of the costly furniture found in Egyptian tombs miniature substitutes are found in Carthaginian coffins—for example these terra-cotta chairs.

*From 'Musée Lavignani,' E. Leroux*





## GLASS VESSELS PRODUCED FOR EXPORT

In Phoenicia the most export among the glass-blowers specialised in the manufacture of ornamental dishes of choice quality. Their delicate workmanship and artistically applied decorations are well illustrated by these representative examples—two large phials, a vase and jug—found in Syria, Cyprus and Rhodes.

From Perrot et Chipiez, 'Histoire de l'Art en Phénicie'

phenomenon which is not unknown in other countries. They preferred to live away from the city in splendid villas the luxury of which astonished the invading soldiers. We could wish to have more details of these, but not one has survived, and we can only suppose that they resembled in arrangement the villas of the Roman period which supplanted them—suites of rooms grouped round one or two courtyards with verandas, and perhaps a set of Turkish bathrooms, in the midst of fishponds and flower-gardens. Here the nobles lived with their hundreds of slaves, who were employed in the intensive culture of their estates.

When the Romans scattered the rest of the books they found in the captured city, they preserved a manual of agriculture and had it translated for the instruction of their own farmers. Fragments of this translation have come down to us, and give us a high opinion of the Carthaginians as scientific agriculturists; and the frequent references to the wealth and resources of their home territories show that their practice did not lag behind their

theory. The whole countryside is described as a succession of orchards, vineyards, olive groves, vegetable gardens and cornfields. Nor was stock-breeding neglected; the Roman army at its landing found 'a multitude of horses, cattle, sheep and goats, such as was not to be seen in all the world.' Asses and mules were the usual beasts of burden; the camel, so familiar nowadays, was not introduced until some centuries later. Another absentee was the pig, for the Carthaginians, true Semites, refused to eat pork, although there is a story, perhaps libellous, that they were addicted to the flesh of dogs.

Honey took the place of sugar; the national dish, the 'Punic porridge,' was a mixture of powdered grain, honey and cheese. Much attention was paid to the vineyards, and wines of popular vintage

were also extensively imported, for the Carthaginians were heavy drinkers. On one occasion a prohibition law was passed forbidding the use of wine to slaves, soldiers, magistrates and members of the Senate; but we are not told how effective the measure proved.

Items of the  
Carthaginian fare

Nothing illustrates more forcibly the original nature of the Carthaginian settlement than the fact that for centuries Carthage was content humbly to pay rent to the native chieftains for the peninsula on which the city was built. But this policy was changed, probably about the fifth century B.C., and Carthage assumed the control of a wide area corresponding roughly to the modern kingdom of Tunis. Much of the land passed into the hands of the Carthaginian nobility, who cultivated it with slave labour; but the greater part was left to the original inhabitants, who were made liable to conscription in the armies and forced to pay heavy taxes. An income-tax of twenty-five per cent. seems to have

been the normal rate, which was doubled on occasions of emergency.

Despite this, the natives, industrious and frugal peasants on a soil which can be rendered exceedingly fertile by scientific irrigation, were economically prosperous; but they were not thereby reconciled to the Carthaginian yoke and frequently revolted. Carthage was singularly deficient in the art in which Rome excelled—of absorbing her subject races.

Beyond this home country was the wider range of the Carthaginian Empire. To the east of Carthage the coast was held to a point considerably east of Tripoli, and jealous watch was kept that the Greeks in Cyrenaica (Benghazi) did not advance farther west. West of the capital there was a string of settlements along the coast as far as the Strait of Gibraltar and beyond, down the Atlantic coast of Morocco. But the settlements were only trading stations, or stopping-places for ships, and none of them possessed much territory.

The hinterland of Algeria was always independent under native Numidian princes, who were for long friendly allies of Carthage, but who in the end, under the famous Masinissa, turned against her and took from her the coast towns and much of the home territory. These

princes were by no means barbarians; the stately tomb of the Medrassen, perhaps that of Masinissa himself, and its younger companion, the 'Tomb of the Christian Woman' at Tipasa, are memorials of their wealth and power. Farther west, in Morocco, Carthaginian authority was even more closely circumscribed by the walls of the settlements.

Outside Africa she held Malta, which was famous for its textile manufactures, and the other small islands about Sicily, of which she long possessed the north-west corner, and at times extended her control over the greater part of the island; but she never succeeded in reducing Syracuse, which Rome captured in a side-campaign with its main armies fighting elsewhere. The Carthaginians were not unpopular in Sicily, and the captured Greek cities often tolerated their rule without reluctance, partly from jealousy of Syracuse, partly because Carthage was astute enough to behave with unusual leniency; the tribute paid by the Greeks was only ten per cent.

Some interesting discoveries have been made at Motya, the military base and headquarters of the Carthaginian administration until 397 B.C., when the Syracusans captured and destroyed the



TESTIMONY TO THE POWER AND WEALTH OF NUMIDIAN PRINCES

The neighbour of Carthage on the west was the rich and independent country of Numidia, which was welded into a powerful kingdom by the native prince Masinissa. Impressive evidence as to the resources commanded by its rulers is afforded by the monument above. Plainly inspired by the pyramids of Egypt, the 'Medrassen' was built (probably) by Masinissa himself, as a burial-place for himself and his successors. The funerary chamber lies in the centre of the mound.



#### REMAINS OF AN IMPORTANT CARTHAGINIAN DEPOT

For a long period the military base of the Carthaginians in Sicily was Motya, a small island off the coast. It was not merely a fortress, but a considerable settlement and a centre of commerce from which important trade lines radiated. High walls surrounded it, thus making it a position of great strength. It was joined to the mainland by an artificial causeway, which reached the island opposite the North Gate. Above we see the remains of the two flanking towers that guarded this entrance.

*From J. I. S. Whitaker, 'Motya,' Geo. Bell & Sons*

place. It is a tiny island seven hundred yards square, joined to the mainland by a causeway. A strong wall ran around it and where the causeway joined was an elaborate gateway; three pairs of massive doors, swinging in stone sockets, were set in the thickness of the wall and in front of these was an outwork with two strong towers standing almost at the water's edge. Here have been found arrow-heads and other traces of the conflict when the town was stormed. At another point was a little harbour measuring fifty by thirty yards, cut into the land and lined with stone quays in imitation of the great harbours of Carthage. In the island of Sardinia (which, as explained in

Chapter 38, had offered a particularly suitable field for exploitation) Carthage accomplished what she had failed to do in Sicily and succeeded in keeping the Greeks out; any Greek ship which ventured near was chased, and if caught rammed and sunk with all hands. But away from the coast Carthaginian authority was nil. The inhabitants, a primitive race of mountaineers, descended from the nuraghi-builders (see page 614), preserved their independence and, except in the way of commerce, had little intercourse with the Carthaginians, who were scattered in several small settlements round the island. As an example of these we may take Nora, south-west of the modern capital,



#### NORA : A CHARACTERISTIC PHOENICIAN SITE IN SARDINIA

Nora, in Sardinia, furnishes a typical example of the site regarded as ideal by the Phoenicians—a small, easily fortifiable peninsula joined to the mainland by a low and narrow isthmus. In Phoenician times the whole peninsula was surrounded by a wall with watch towers, remains of which have been unearthed, together with foundations of a temple of Tanit and two cemeteries. Relics of the later Roman occupation include ruins of a theatre, an amphitheatre and a watch tower.

*From G. Patroni, 'Monumenti Antichi del Lirici'*

Cagliari. This was built on a flattish peninsula, which was surrounded by a wall with towers; in the centre is a tiny temple of Tanit; and outside the settlement were the cemeteries. Some objects from a more important site, Tharros, are in the British Museum.

In the much smaller Balearic Islands a similar condition prevailed. Carthage had a few trading ports on the coast, but had little or no control over the interior. Corsica she left to the Etruscans and on the Riviera coast she had been forestalled by the Greeks, whose colony at Marseilles was strong enough to control the situation. In Spain, where Cadiz (Gades) was a very old Phoenician settlement, Carthage on the contrary contrived to close the south-east coast to Greek adventurers.

Between the First and Second Punic Wars Hamilcar and Hannibal widely extended the sphere of Carthaginian influence in Spain, partly by hard fighting, partly by diplomatic alliances with native princes. But this was an ephemeral success, lost before the Second War was over; and away from the coast there are few traces in Spain of the presence of Carthaginians. Some curious statues found in eastern Spain have been referred to as evidence of Phoenician influence—the best known is the 'Elche' head in the Louvre at Paris, a work of rare beauty—but there is nothing distinctively Phoenician about them.

Such was the Carthaginian Empire, this string of trading posts and refuges for shipping. Except Carthage itself, none of them ever controlled any extent of territory and all were vastly inferior in size and population to the metropolis. Palermo at its surrender to the Romans had 25,000 inhabitants; in all there may have been a dozen places of similar



#### EXQUISITE BUST FOUND IN SPAIN

The dignified and freshly beautiful Elche head (c. fourth century B.C.) has affinities with both Asiatic and archaic Greek work. It has been claimed that the oriental elements in it are evidence of Phoenician influence in Spanish art; actually there is nothing distinctively Phoenician in the bust.

*From 'Monuments et Mémoires,' Fondation Piot*

size. Most of the settlements were far smaller. Some were old Phoenician foundations and these held a privileged position as 'free and independent allies'; Utica, on the mainland, an older and more venerable city than Carthage itself, to the end is cited in official documents as an equal partner in the confederacy. Others were new colonies sent out from Carthage; on one occasion, thirty thousand men and women emigrated to found seven new cities on the Atlantic coast of Morocco. We may assume that these daughter settlements were from the first set under definite obligations to the mother city.

The hegemony of Carthage over the whole area was of slow and gradual growth; and Carthage never developed any system

of imperial administration. Community of race and culture, and the necessity for union in the face of common foes, were the ties which bound her empire together. If her policy was successful through some centuries, at no time did she inspire her subjects with any affection for her, or with any racial patriotism. To give one example, Utica, the most favoured city, consistently showed a jealous desire to profit by the troubles of Carthage and in the end frankly deserted to Rome.

The subject cities had to pay tribute, to submit to conscription in time of need and to acquiesce in any limitation of trade with the foreigner that Carthage might impose; for instance, Roman ships might trade with Carthage, but with no other city along the African coast. On the other hand, within the empire they enjoyed the same private rights as the Carthaginians. Most important of all, when menaced by danger, they could claim the protection of the central military and naval forces. In the management of their internal affairs they possessed a wide measure of independence and in most of them the

government was modelled upon that of Carthage itself.

Aristotle, the greatest political philosopher of antiquity, observed that 'Carthage appears to be on the whole a well governed state,' and praised its constitution for showing that due combination of the three principles of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy which he held essential to the stability of a state. The quality of stability is the theme of other ancient writers, who remark that Carthage was singularly free from the revolutions and tyrannies with which the history of Greek states is crowded. It is plain that Carthage had in course of time succeeded in evolving a system of government which was in no way inferior to that of her more civilized neighbours and which shows a remarkable resemblance to the Roman constitution. It would be interesting to know whether the coincidence is due to imitation or to independent evolution.

At the head came the two Suffetes, or Judges—the word is the same as that used in the Old Testament—who like the Roman consuls were elected by the people from



RIFLED GRAVES AND MARSH-FILLED HARBOURS OF ANCIENT UTICA

In ancient times Utica stood at the mouth of the Bagradas (Mejerda), but owing to alluvial deposits the river is now twelve miles to the north and the site is chiefly grazing ground with few visible traces of its Phoenician occupation save the Punic cemetery. The settlement was established 300 years before Carthage and became an important commercial centre eclipsed only by Carthage. In the Third Punic War Utica adhered to the Romans, by whom it was subsequently greatly developed.

From F. W. Kelsey, 'Excavations at Carthage,' *American Journal of Archaeology*

among the Senators and held office for a year. They convened and presided over the Senate and at the expiration of their term of office resumed their seats in its ranks. Originally they led the armies in battle, but with the growth of military science this duty was delegated to generals. The Senate, composed of the heads of the noble families, three hundred strong, deliberated all questions of public policy; but the decision on all vital matters lay with the assembly of the people, in which all male citizens had the vote. The authority of the last-named body was, however, circumscribed; it could only accept or reject without power to amend a proposition put before it by the Senate. It elected the Suffetes and Generals, but here again it had no right of nomination, simply choosing between the candidates submitted to it by the Senate, which thus ensured the election of its men.

Such were the main outlines, but the reality was probably more complicated; we read of Councils of Thirty and of Ten, which may have been

**Complicated system of Councils** inner committees of the Senate; also of a Council of One Hundred, which was, at any rate originally, concerned with the administration of justice. But from the scanty and scattered information which we possess we cannot be certain how far these bodies were permanent features of the constitution, or how far their authority may have varied at different times.

As was the case at Rome, the real power resided in the Senate, and was thus in the hands of a narrow circle of wealthy men, who showed all the faults as well as the virtues proverbially found in such oligarchies. It was narrow, selfish, suspicious; capable of the grossest ingratitude and treachery to men who had served it well. Yet before we condemn it, we should bear in mind the weighty words of a great Roman, Cicero, spoken nearly a hundred years after Carthage had fallen, when even Rome could be fair to its old enemy: 'Carthage would not have held an empire for six hundred years had it not been governed with wisdom and statecraft.'

Membership of the Senate tended to become hereditary in certain families (the

inscription given in page 1620, left, shows a man descended from two generations of Suffetes), but there was no definite division into castes or classes; any man who had acquired wealth could aspire to a place within the circle. Nor was there as much jealousy of strangers as in most ancient states; intermarriage with foreigners was common.

At the same time **Comparative freedom socially, if not from Caste distinctions legally**, the upper classes tended to be definitely distinct in sympathy and interest from the bulk of the population, and violent ebullitions of party feeling were not uncommon, often leading to sharp reversals of policy and not infrequently gravely hampering the executive. For instance, it is often supposed that the popular party supported Hannibal's war policy, while the aristocracy favoured peace with Rome and throughout the Second War hampered or prevented the sending of reinforcements to him in Italy. Women and slaves, of course, had no political rights.

We possess more detailed information of the war services than of any other side of the national life; yet even here how far we are from complete knowledge may be judged by the number of historians who have been led to misrepresent Carthaginian military methods. We read constantly that they won their battles by sheer weight of numbers, 'hurling their mercenaries on the enemy with a disregard for human life which no Greek general leading the militia of his fellow-citizens would have dared to exhibit.' Mercenaries are not prone to sacrifice their lives unnecessarily. The current view is based no doubt on the huge numbers which the Greek historians assign to the Carthaginian armies, and a moment's reflection will show how little these are to be trusted. When one writer gives 300,000, another 100,000, as the strength of an army, our conclusion must be that no definite information was available and that both numbers are mere guesses. And in many instances we are able by a little cross-examination to show their impossibility.

In 309 B.C., we read, the Carthaginians had 125,000 men in Sicily. The Greek

counterstroke was to run the gauntlet of the Carthaginian navy and land an expeditionary force in Africa; whereupon the government, panic-stricken at this unexpected manoeuvre, recalled in all haste every man who could be spared from Sicily—5,000 were sent. Clearly the original army was only a fraction of 125,000. Again in 261 B.C. a Carthaginian force lost 3,200 killed and 4,000 prisoners, 'the greater part of the force being destroyed'; yet we are asked to believe that it numbered 56,000 men.

It is probable that the land armaments of Carthage were never more powerful than at the beginning of the Second Punic

War, when, if Sicily and Sardinia were lost, a far more fruitful field for recruiting had been temporarily gained in Spain, and when the two ablest generals she ever produced had been for years deliberately building up an army for the war of revenge against Rome, of whose strength in the field they had had bitter experience. It will be interesting to examine the figures for this period in detail.

Hannibal himself has recorded that on his arrival in Italy he had 26,000 men; and this we may take as trustworthy. Going back, the ancient historians give him 46,000 on the Rhône; we know that he suffered casualties while crossing the Alps, but a loss of 20,000 is surprisingly high. We are told further that he began his march from Spain with 102,000 men, of whom he sent back 11,000 to their homes and dropped another 11,000 on his lines of communication; this leaves 80,000, and how this number should have shrunk to 46,000 at the Rhône is a complete puzzle, as he had no serious fighting on the way. Farther back still, we come to even more fantastic numbers, as that he brought up 150,000 to besiege the tiny town of Saguntum. Clearly his field army never numbered more than 60,000. Add that he had posted garrisons of 16,000 men in Spain, and 20,000 in Africa, where there may have existed a few old territorial corps not included on the strength of his 'New Army'; the total under arms at the beginning of the Second Punic War then comes to about 100,000 and we

may well doubt whether Carthage ever possessed a larger army.

In time of peace a small permanent force was maintained in garrison in the capital and elsewhere; but this was only a police for the preservation of public order, and armies were mobilised on the outbreak of war and dismissed on the conclusion of peace. The result was that the beginning of hostilities almost inevitably brought defeat to Carthage, who resembled modern Turkey in that she only began to fight when the campaign seemed lost.

We must not forget that the Carthaginian government regarded war from a purely commercial point of view. It was often better business to accept defeat than to persist in a long and expensive struggle; and hence disasters which would have broken the self-respect of any other nation left Carthage unperturbed. Only on the rare occasions when invaders penetrated into Africa did the nation bestir itself, and then it fought with fanatical fury; when there was no issue of life or death, but simply a question of extending or defending the empire, the government mobilised a reasonably adequate minimum of troops and sent them forth. If they failed, it wrote off the campaign as a bad speculation and made peace, venting its rage on the defeated general, who was generally crucified 'pour encourager les autres.'

Carthaginian armies then were not strong in number, but they contained excellent material and were well organized, being largely composed

of professional soldiers Set tactics of the third century B.C. resembled

the era before Napoleon in being an age of professional soldiers and elaborate set tactics. A battle of the fifth century B.C. was a push of one line of heavy armed spearmen against another. In the fourth century the idea grew of strengthening the line at one point into a column which by sheer weight could smash through the opposing line. To prevent this, the line was everywhere thickened into a mass—the 'phalanx'—and armed with longer spears, like medieval pikemen; a conflict of two such phalanxes was as complete a deadlock as trench warfare. Then came the invention of combined tactics

under Alexander and his successors—while the infantry attacked in front, the cavalry rode at the flank.

The countermove for this was for the other side also to possess cavalry, which could outflank in its turn; and then the expedient remained of breaking the phalanx by a frontal attack of 'tanks,' that is, elephants, supported by an 'artillery preparation' of stones and arrows from light-armed infantry. Like the tanks on the Somme, elephants were irresistible the first time they were used; but the terror they inspired soon evaporated, and by the end of a campaign they were more of a danger to their own side than to the enemy. The final solution of the tactical problem was due to Rome, which abandoned the phalanx formation and broke up the line of battle into mobile units, able to beat off cavalry and elephants and to manoeuvre at will round the enemy.

But, were we more fully informed, it is possible that to the Carthaginian generals Hannibal or Hamilcar should be given much of the credit of this innovation which secured to Rome the mastery of the world. Carthage had light troops and elephants in plenty and the best cavalry in the world; she was lacking in infantry of the line who could face the Roman legions. In Spain, the two Carthaginian leaders found the material that had been wanting, and probably at the same time introduced the more flexible battle formations which Rome afterwards made her own.

The army was scientifically organized on the model developed by Alexander the Great and his successors. Its personnel was of very varied character; probably

almost every nation on earth was represented in the ranks, but we can broadly distinguish four main classes of troops. First, the Carthaginians themselves were not subject to conscription, save in times of national peril, but generally supplied a force of volunteers. Warfare was not unfashionable as a pastime with the upper classes, who had the custom of wearing a ring for every campaign they had served; and most armies included a 'Sacred Band' of young nobles who formed a richly equipped body-guard for the general.



**NORTH AFRICAN CHIEF**

Native Africans under their own leaders—contingents like the Libyan and Numidian cavalry—were always to be found in Carthaginian armies. This bronze head of a native (probably Libyan) chief is by a Greek (early third century B.C.).

*British Museum*

They were armed with bronze round helmets, iron corselets and circular shields, spears and swords.

Second came the 'subjects,' drawn by conscription from the natives of the home territories, who supplied the bulk of the light infantry—slingers, javelin-men and archers. Third were the 'allies' drawn from the cities and native principalities which in theory were independent of Carthage; these native tribes would often have to be bribed into sending contingents, and thus their troops would often be indistinguishable from the fourth class, the mercenaries, roving adventurers of every country who sold their swords for pay.

Sardinia and the Balearic Islands gave more light infantry, while from Algeria came the famous Libyan cavalry which Hannibal used with fatal effect. Mounted on ugly little horses which were yet amazingly swift and enduring, wearing no armour and carrying no baggage, their only arms a light leathern buckler, a dagger and a few darts, they struck terror



by the rapidity of their movements and the ferocity of their courage. Their tactics were to dash at full gallop towards the enemy, uttering loud cries and hurling their darts, either creating a gap in the line or enticing their opponents to dash forward and close with them, which proved fatal; for the Libyans by a feigned retreat would draw them out, and then swinging round attack on all sides. From Spain came Hannibal's infantry, wearing white tunics with purple borders, but no body armour, round shields and the short stabbing sword which the Roman legions later adopted from them.

Hannibal also enrolled numbers of Gauls, who rushed into battle stripped to the waist, carrying long oval shields and long broadswords; brave in the charge, they were drunken in camp and lazy on the march. An arm much employed in early wars was the war-chariot, but this had disappeared by the time of Hannibal, its place being taken by the elephants, which were protected by hanging plates and bore archers in towers on their backs. The first Carthaginian elephants were imported from Asia, but there is reason to believe that they later tamed and employed the African variety.

Turning to the navy, we find the same tendency to exaggerate Carthaginian power. Our old authorities represent Carthage as boasting that no Roman dared bathe in the sea but by her leave, and Rome as possessing not a single battleship and only learning how to build them by copying from a Carthaginian wreck that came ashore. There is, in fact, strong evidence that for years before the First Punic War Rome had been paying attention to naval affairs; and from the beginning of hostilities we find her taking the water with fleets steadily superior to anything Carthage had afloat.

At Ecnomus, the greatest sea battle of antiquity, we read that Rome had 330 ships with 140,000 men, Carthage 350 with 150,000. Now it has been shown that the Roman figure is made up of 100 transports plus 230 fighting ships, and that in the battle Carthage was outnumbered; she then had not much

more than 200 battleships, nor is it likely that all were of the largest size. Other figures also suggest that throughout the war the maximum naval force of Carthage was about 200 vessels; and seeing that there does not appear to have been any lack of material, we must explain this limitation as due to insufficiency of man-power; Carthage had not crews available for larger fleets.

On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt that as seamen the Carthaginians were individually superior to the Roman crews. They maintained the old traditional sea tactics, outrowing and outflanking the enemy and then striking home with the ram. The Romans recognized their inferiority in this manoeuvre, and strove to replace skill by brute force; they aimed for a steady ten per cent. superiority in numbers; they ordered their vessels to claw on to the Carthaginians, ship for ship, with grappling irons and drawbridges; and then their soldiers and their extra numbers gave them the victory. In the Second Punic War we hear little of the Carthaginian fleet; either the government failed to support Hannibal, or it was realized that competition with Rome afloat was useless.


The First Punic War came at an age of Dreadnought building; the 'three-banked' ship of the sea empire of Athens had given place to vessels with five, seven, nine and even thirty or forty banks. 'Dreadnoughts' in These were long low the Punic Wars vessels built for speed

on the lines of a destroyer; they carried small masts and sails, but in action these were stowed and the ship depended on the speed of its oars. Exactly how the 'banks' of oars were arranged is a problem; the old idea that they were rows of men set one above the other, each pulling one oar, has been sharply criticised even for the three-banked ship and is obviously unthinkable for the bigger vessels, which probably were like medieval galleys, with many men pulling at long sweeps. The standard type for the line of battle was the five-banked ship, the 'quinquereme,' which carried 300 oars in its hold, and 120 fighting men on small decks fore and aft.

Very different from the swift war-galleys were the round-boats, the Carthaginian commercial ships. In these cargo capacity, not speed, was the object and their lines were correspondingly broad and ample. They relied upon the wind, with perhaps a few sweeps to take them in or out of harbour in calms, and had a single mast, with a huge square sail. They were often of considerable size, capable of holding several hundred tons of cargo. In such craft the Carthaginians lumbered at four or five knots from port to port along the Mediterranean and out into the Atlantic. They were no fair-weather sailors, but put out at all times and were not afraid to lose sight of land and make for the open sea. When the Greeks still sailed by the Pleiades, the Carthaginians had discovered how to set a course by the Pole Star, a far more serviceable guide. These vessels and the warships all belonged to the city of Carthage; the other towns of the empire do

not appear to have been allowed anything bigger than a fishing boat.

Phoenician exploration and trade in the Atlantic afford a fascinating subject to the imagination. For about a hundred years the Greeks obtained a share of it by forming an alliance with Arganthonius, the native King of Tarshish, or Tartessus, at the southern extremity of Spain; but before 500 B.C. Carthage conquered Tartessus and barred the way to the Greeks, and henceforward for three hundred years monopolised the trade until she lost Spain at the end of the Second Punic War. During this long period one Greek adventurer, Pytheas, ran the gauntlet and came back with strange stories of unknown lands, only to be called a liar for his pains; but otherwise the Carthaginian blockade of the Strait of Gibraltar was complete, and their knowledge of what lay beyond was jealously guarded. Terrifying accounts of the danger of Atlantic gales and tides



#### MEDIEVAL ILLUSTRATION OF THE GREAT WARSHIPS OF CARTHAGE AND GREECE

The rowers of the great triremes of Venice were disposed in groups of three to a bench. Every man had an oar, and the three oars of each group passed through the same rowlock-port, as in this model. It is probable that the same arrangement was applied in Greek and Carthaginian triremes, though in the larger galleys, such as five-banked vessels ('quinqueremes'), the reference must be to the number of rowers to each sweep. In any case the 'banks' can scarcely have been superimposed.


From Fieschi, 'Le Triremi'

were assiduously spread abroad. Once some Greeks tried to map the route by following in the wake of a Carthaginian ship; whereupon the captain ran his vessel on the rocks rather than betray the secret of the channel, and for doing this he was richly rewarded by the government.

The consequence of this secrecy is that we have little definite information about the Atlantic trade. It was in the main a quest for metals—gold from tropical Africa, silver from Spain, tin from Spain, Brittany and Cornwall; and tin was probably the most important item, as bronze, of which it is a necessary ingredient, played a larger part in ancient life than nowadays. There is little reason to doubt that the Phoenicians did exploit the deposits of Cornwall, and they probably explored still farther north in the search for markets. Going southwards for gold, they may have visited the African coast as far as the Cameroons, and there

is a legend that a Phoenician ship once circumnavigated the continent. The existence of the Canary Islands and Madeira was vaguely known; one story says they concealed their knowledge of Madeira, thinking it might serve as a refuge if they were driven from Carthage.

On these barbarian shores trade was carried on by barter with infinite precautions against surprise or treachery. The Carthaginians would land on some empty beach, set out their wares—glass beads, coloured ribbons and the like—light a signal fire and retire to their ships. Under cover of night the natives would approach and set opposite what they had to offer—gold-dust or ivory—and then retire in their turn. Next morning the Carthaginians would return; if the exchange proposed was satisfactory, they took it and sailed away; if not, they returned again to their ships and waited another twenty-four hours, and the next



BEAD NECKLACES FROM PHOENICIAN BAZAARS

Phoenicians carried on a brisk trade in beads, cheap trinkets and gaudy articles of paltry value with all the backward peoples with whom they came in contact on their wanderings. Above are three specimens of the bead necklaces with which they flooded the native markets and with which the poorer women of Carthage itself were glad to deck themselves, for men and women alike had a passion for jewelry and loaded themselves with trinkets of any value they could afford.


*British Museum*

night the natives added more gold-dust; and thus the bargain was eventually struck. Throughout the whole transaction scrupulous honesty was observed, but neither side saw or exchanged a word with the other. The Carthaginians had an evil name as kidnappers.

The statements in ancient writers that Carthage grew rich on its commerce are too many and precise to be ignored. In the fifth century B.C. she was said to possess 'much gold and silver'; in the second, before her destruction, a careful historian calls her 'the richest town in the world.' Yet here again the facts as we know them suggest that we must not form too high an idea of the value of Carthaginian trade.

It is a commonplace that commercial intercourse on any scale demands some medium of intercourse. By the sixth century B.C. the trading cities of Greece all possessed a coinage for this purpose. But Carthage never coined money till the very end of the fifth century, when some poor imitations of coins of Syracuse were struck to pay the mercenaries during a campaign in Sicily. Later the coinage grew terribly debased and must have offered endless problems of exchange. Further, no definite system of weights and measures was ever adopted, but several standards were in use simultaneously. These facts are significant. On the other hand, Carthage must be credited with the invention of the bank-note; pieces of leather stamped with values circulated throughout the empire.

The Phoenicians lost their markets in the eastern and richer half of the Mediterranean through sheer inability to compete with the Greeks. If they kept the western half, it was through no improvement in trading methods, but simply because for long they were strong enough by military force to keep competitors at a distance. But in the areas which Carthage ear-marked for herself, the opportunities for trade must have been limited. Sparsely inhabited by poor native tribes who provided for themselves the plain necessities of life, they could have offered at most a restricted field for imports of the looking-glass and trinket



#### A LATE-ADOPTED CURRENCY

Carthaginian coinage only begins in about 410 B.C. The types owe much to Syracusan coinage (compare page 1380); but they are rough and debased, the top-right specimen here being quite exceptional. Horse, palm-tree and heads of Persephone are prevalent designs.

British Museum

class, and occasionally a few more expensive articles to grace the court of some chief. Slave dealing was another source of profit, including an exploitation of the white slave traffic; in the Balearic Islands one trained dancing girl from Carthage was valued at five grown men.

There was a large importation of goods from the civilized parts of the Mediterranean; but it is remarkable that while these foreign products have been found in quantities by excavators, they are with scarcely any exception the cheapest and commonest specimens of their class. To give an instance, Greek vases are common, but almost invariably of the most paltry value; there is scarcely a single specimen worthy to rank with the masterpieces which the Etruscans loved to collect, and which to-day are the pride of our museums. To judge from what excava-

Limited scope  
for commerce

tion has revealed, the Carthaginians were the sixpenny-bazaar keepers of antiquity. It is most reasonable to suppose that the wealth of the city was mainly due to its import of raw metals from the Atlantic; and when this ceased after the Second Punic War Carthage probably gained more revenue by the agricultural development of its hinterland than by sea trade. Of the caravan trade with central Africa we know nothing, save that it existed.

The age in which Carthage played its greatest part in the world history, the third century B.C., saw a great expansion of civilization of the European type, as developed in Greece and Italy. At the beginning of the century the conquest of Alexander had thrown open Egypt and the Orient to the new influences; by the end, the western Mediterranean had been subjected to their control, and the way was open to the marvellous development of ordered city life which culminated in the Roman Empire. In this expansion Carthage was an alien element.

The Carthaginians were cordially disliked by their contemporaries. Bearded

Oriental in loose robes, covered with gaudy trinkets, often with great rings of gold hanging from their nostrils, dripping with perfumes, cringing and salaaming, they inspired disgust as much by their personal appearance as by their sensual appetites, their treacherous cruelty, their blood-stained religion. To the end they remained bucksters, intent

on personal gain, careless or incapable of winning the good will of their subjects. Yet Rome's own record of imperial administration for two hundred years to come was to be as black as anything that can be said of Carthage; and in the evolution of civic government Carthage was not inferior to any of her contemporaries. For the long wars that led to her ruin Roman greed and ambition must be held responsible; and her final destruction was an unnecessary crime.

If we have been led to emphasise the real weakness of Carthaginian power, it only throws greater light on the splendid tenacity which for so long maintained the desperate struggle against the greatest

military nation of antiquity. And whatever may have been the faults inherent in the Carthaginian character, a race which produced Hamilcar and Hannibal is not without a title to our respect, just as its unmerited destruction will always claim our sympathy. As there was no excuse, so there was no reason for Rome to exterminate its old adversary. The day of Carthage had passed. Her old trading areas, in which she had pursued her antiquated system of petty peddling and jealous monopoly, had been thrown open to a more progressive civilization, which was destined not only to exploit but finally to incorporate the nations of the West. Yet we cannot but regret her end, remembering that for many centuries she had ruled the seas and that she had been the mother of brave sons.



ACCOMPLISHED WOMEN OF LONG AGO

These little statuettes, of a dancing girl (right) and of a girl playing a double flute, recall the existence among the Carthaginians of a large and profitable traffic in women. The flute player is a very fine and charming piece of work, definitely Greek. The cruder dancer is of Carthaginian workmanship.

From "Musée Lavigerie", E. Leroux, Paris

# PATRICIANS AND PLEBS: ROME'S WARRING FACTIONS

A Phase of the Gradual Social Adjustment whereby  
the City on the Tiber consolidated her Power

By H. STUART-JONES

Principal of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth; late Camden Professor of  
Ancient History in the University of Oxford; Author of *Classical Rome*, etc.

IN the early history of Rome as recounted by Livy and other writers the 'strife of the orders,' as it is called, plays a large part. The fathers ('patres') on the one hand, the multitude ('plebs') on the other, are represented as waging a perpetual struggle from the earliest years of the republic until the time when, more than two centuries later, the plebs acquired sovereign rights co-ordinate with those of the Roman State. Even after this date the distinction between 'patricii' and 'plebei' continued to subsist.

To the former belonged certain religious privileges; the ancient priesthood of Jupiter, for example, hedged about as it was with taboos which must have made it highly irksome to the holder, and the office of 'Rex Sacrorum' (king of rites) which preserved a simulacrum of the monarchy, were reserved for them, and a form of sacramental marriage ('confarreatio') practised by patricians qualified the issue for these posts. In name the right of consulting the gods and ascertaining their pleasure before taking action on behalf of the state belonged only to the patres, although by a legal fiction the holders of all the great civil offices of state known as 'patrician magistracies' could 'take the auspices.' Only in one case did the ancient privilege revive, and that was when, owing to the failure to hold valid elections, the year opened with a vacancy in the supreme magistracy. Then 'the auspices returned to the patres,' that is to say, to the patrician members of the Senate, until an 'interrex' had been appointed and had restored the civil magistracy.

The patres in this narrow sense also went through the formality of ratifying

in advance the acts of the people in its assembly. These ancient but empty privileges were counterbalanced by certain political disabilities; for the 'patricius' could neither vote in the assemblies of the plebs nor be elected to its magistracies; and since the tribuneship gave great opportunities to a would-be democratic leader, it was not unknown for a patrician to divest himself of his rank—as was done by Clodius, the enemy of Cicero—in order to become a candidate for this office.

What was the origin of these distinctions of rank and privilege? The Roman writers themselves speak with somewhat uncertain voice. The constitutional lawyers of later times seem to have held the *Uncertain origin* view (in which some of the *Patricians* modern authorities have followed them) that the patricians were originally the only citizens of Rome in the true sense of the word. A jurist of Cicero's time held that they were identical with the 'ingenui' (free-born Romans) of his own day; and the word 'patricius' was, by an absurd derivation, made to mean 'one who can point to a father.' In a speech put by Livy into the mouth of a plebeian orator the patres are made to claim that they alone 'possess the institution of the family' ('gens'); and there was a cause célèbre in which the patrician gens of the Claudii claimed the estate of a freedman from the plebeian stock of the same name and endeavoured (we must suppose) to establish the presumption that they had originally been the only citizens to bear the Claudian name.

This view is hard to reconcile with that which our narrative sources present of the



AN OBSERVER OF AUSPICES

In early Rome only the 'patres' could 'take the auspices,' that is, read anguries from the flight of birds before state action. Probably it was a native Italic custom; above, however, is an Etruscan 'augur'—unless, as has been suggested, he is merely frightening birds.

From Waage, 'Etruskische Malerei'

origin of the patriciate. The legend ran that the founder of Rome selected the heads ('patres') of a hundred 'gentes' to form his senate, and that they and their descendants composed the patrician body, which was recruited by additions made by later kings, such as the six 'Alban' families admitted by Tullus Hostilius on the fall of Alba Longa, or the hundred 'junior families' ('minores gentes') whose heads were summoned to the Senate by Tarquin the Elder. Even after the expulsion of the kings the Claudii, who were said to be of Sabine stock, were admitted by Senate and people to the charmed circle.

Moreover, there is not a hint in our historians that the struggle of the orders was one in which an alien body enforced a claim to citizenship in a community in which it had originally no part. It is also a noteworthy fact that, if we except Romulus and the Etruscan Tarquins, the kings of Rome bear the names of plebeian gentes, Pompilius, Hostilius, Marcius and Tullius, and that some of the hills on which Rome was built, such as the Oppius and the Caelius, are named after plebeian

families. Finally, at least one of the three earliest tribes, the Tities or Titienses, may be connected with the plebeian gens of the Titii. All these facts point to the conclusion that the group of families known as patrician, in whose hands the government of the nascent Republic lay, was formed by a selective process within a much wider circle of gentes.

The institution of the gens is found amongst all the Italic peoples, as well as the Etruscans. It is implied in the system of nomenclature common to all these peoples, which stands in marked contrast to that of the Greeks. The Greek, unless he belonged to one of the ancient families which traced its descent to a hero or god, and employed a patronymic, bore an individual name, and of these there was an infinite variety. In Italy he was known by a name chosen from a limited group—only about fifteen such are at all common among the Romans—but to this was added a second, adjectival in form, and usually ending in '-jus' (Fabius, Julius, etc.), which he shared with a large number of persons whose relationship with him it would in most cases have been impossible to trace in historical times; and these were his 'gentiles.'

An obvious analogy suggests itself in the Celtic clan, and since the Latin language has certain affinities with Celtic, in which it differs from Greek, a similarity of institutions between these branches of the Indo-European stock would not surprise us; but if

The Gens an  
Italic institution

anything like the chieftainship as found in the Highlands or in Ireland existed in prehistoric Italy, it had given way to the more concentrated authority of the head of the household ('paterfamilias') in the earliest days of Rome. It is difficult to say whether the gens owned common property, more especially in land. In historical times the estate of one who died intestate and without leaving an heir could be claimed in the first place by his 'agnati,' that is, those whose relationship to him by descent in the male line could be traced, and in default of such persons, by his 'gentiles,' who were defined by the lawyers as those of the same name whose ancestry showed no taint of servile

origin ; and this remote reversionary interest was all that the gens of later days retained.

It has been maintained that at the time of the first settlement of the Italic peoples land was held in common by the gentes, the individuals receiving only a small plot of two 'jugera' (about an acre and one-third) in separate ownership under the name of 'heredium.' This, even if supplemented by a right to common pasturage, would not have been sufficient to support a growing family. Moreover, the terms used in legal transactions for the transference of property ('mancipatio,' 'res Mancipi') imply that the object of the transfer can be grasped with the hand, and in conveyances a symbolical act took place by which landed estate was represented by a clod of earth. This, however, hardly proves more than that the forms of purchase and sale date back to a period before permanent settlement and are, therefore, adapted to movable goods.



#### ROME'S LEGENDARY RULERS

On these coins of the late republic are represented three of the traditional kings of Rome: Romulus, Numa and Ancus Marcius, and the great first consul, Lucius Brutus (bottom left).

From Bernoulli, 'Römische Ikonographie'

At the same time, a close association of the gentes with the soil is implied in the fact that when local tribes were formed at Rome, in which both individuals and their property were registered, those outside the city took their names from well known gentes, most (if not all) patrician, who formed no doubt the leading groups of settlers in the several districts ; and we are told that when the Sabine Claudii were admitted to the Roman community they were

allotted a tract of land across the Anio, as well as a burial place at the foot of the Capitol. Such common burial places, in fact, remained in the possession of gentes in historical times. There were also ties of common worship and sacrifices which united the members of a gens ; during the siege of Rome by the Gauls, one of the Fabii, so the story goes, passed through the enemy's lines to the Quirinal and performed the rites of his clan unmolested. Nor is corporate action by the



#### WHERE STOOD A LATIN CITY MORE ANCIENT THAN ROME

According to tradition the hegemony of the Latin confederation was wrested from the old religious centre, Alba Longa, by the Romans under King Tullus Hostilius. The city—which was of great antiquity and was indeed believed to have founded Rome—was totally destroyed ; its lands were annexed and its people assimilated with the conquerors, six families being admitted to the patrician order. It lay in the Alban Hills south-east of Rome, on the site of the modern Castel Gandolfo.

Photo, Anderson



gens unknown; the Claudii and the Manlii forbade the use of the names Lucius and Marcus respectively to their members, because of disgraceful acts committed by the bearers of those names.

Now there is no doubt whatever that in the historical period plebeian gentes existed and had the rights and functions described above. The leading case which established the exclusive claim of the gentiles to burial in the common tomb, sanctified by the private rites of the gens, concerned such a plebeian clan. And the laws of the Twelve Tables, which held good for patres and plebs alike, recognize 'gentile' rights. How then are we to account for the exclusive privileges so long retained by the patricians?

Several modern writers have traced the distinction of patres and plebs to the difference between a conquering and a subjugated race. It has been suggested that the patricians represented the invading 'Italic' stock, the plebs the 'Ligurian' aboriginal population; others would make the patricians Sabine and the plebs Latin, while others again reverse this latter distinction. It has even been maintained that the patricians were of Etruscan race.


None of these theories is based on convincing arguments.

Mommsen suggested that the origin of the plebs was to be sought in the system of clientship. There is no doubt that in early Rome the great families attracted to themselves large bodies of 'clients,' who placed themselves under their protection, or, as the Romans put it, 'in fide,' a phrase which survived in use until later times, when the Aetolians, who had placed themselves under the protection of the 'good faith' of the Roman people, were astonished to find that this implied surrender at discretion; and a law, in part preserved, inspired by Gaius Gracchus, forbids the magistrate to assign as advocates to provincials who prosecute a governor for maladministration anyone who is in this relation to him or whose ancestors have been in the same relation to those of the defendant. It was the client's duty to follow his patron to battle, to contribute to his ransom and to the dowry of his daughter, and (according to the narrative of Livy) to support him by his vote in the assembly, while the obligation of protection imposed on the patron was only second in sanctity to that of parenthood, so that in Vergil's *Inferno* the violation of the two is mentioned in the same breath in the line:

pulsatusve parens vel fraus innexa clienti.

Nor was clientage an institution peculiar to the Romans, as we may judge from the migration of the Claudii to Rome 'with a huge band of clients,' as Livy puts it. Its origin is traced by legend to the founder of Rome, who, according to Cicero, distributed the plebs as clients among the noble families; but it is, of course, a natural economic result of the settlement of powerful family-groups upon conquered territory. The relation might also arise owing to the manumission of slaves, who on receiving their freedom took the name of their master, who now became their 'patronus.'

But clientage will not suffice to account for the existence of so large and powerful a body as the plebs of Rome. The 'clients' were, no doubt, plebeians; but the leaders of the plebeian movement were not neces-



FAMILY VAULT OF THE SCIPIOS

Each Roman 'gens' had its funeral rites and its private tomb. This plan of the ruined vault of the Scipios, patrician members of the Cornelian gens, is taken from the 18th century drawing by Piranesi, the site having suffered since.

From Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*

sarily clients who had shaken off the ties which bound them to patrician families. Many of them were, doubtless, well-to-do members of the trading class, and although (for their own political ends) they succeeded in harnessing the forces of discontent, especially that which arose from the rigorous application of the severe Roman law of debt, their aim was to break down the barriers of privilege maintained by a limited group of families whose superiority they deemed artificial.

It seems, then, best to conclude that the closed circle of patrician families was gradually formed, largely by an

economic process, with-  
**Economic causes of** in a large citizen-body.  
**class distinction** just as in Athens the

'Eupatrid' families, in whom the Greek writers on Roman affairs found an analogy with the patricians, were, according to modern views, not the cells out of which the city state was built up, but close corporations formed in the bosom of the settled community, so in Rome the more powerful gentes created for themselves a privileged status under the monarchical regime, and when they at length succeeded in overthrowing it, took into their hands the control of the newly-fledged Republic. The fact that they gave their names to the local tribe-divisions implies that their possessions lay in the district adjacent to the city; as the territory of Rome was gradually extended and fresh elements were incorporated into the state the plebs naturally grew in numbers and importance. Its members were, however, excluded both from the supreme magistracy of the state, represented since the fall of the monarchy by the two consuls, and from the permanent council of the patres—the Senate.

The traditional account of the struggle by which the plebs achieved its ends contains much that is doubtful. It was repugnant to constitutional lawyers of the Ciceronian age to admit what was the fact, namely, that the ancient institutions of Rome, based on the 'mos majorum,' or Customs of the Ancestors, which they held in perpetual veneration, had been transformed by the intrusion of a revolutionary element, and we may dis-

regard their attempts to gloss over the truth. It is not without interest, as illustrating the Roman method of solving political problems, to compare the rise of the plebs with analogous movements in more recent times.

We find in the plebs an organized body external to the state which claims and obtains political power. It is not altogether fanciful to compare it in this respect with the Fascist organization in Italy and the Communist party in Russia. Both succeeded in making themselves supreme in their respective countries; but whereas Fascism did not alter the form of the constitution, an hereditary monarchy with an elective parliament, but secured the exclusive control of the organs of government and confirmed it by legislation, the Russian Communist party set up, first in the All-Russian Congress of Soviets and then in the Federal Union of Republics of which that forms the nucleus, an entirely new system which it dominated, and which it substituted for the previously existing fabric of government with the expressed object of replacing an apparatus capable of functioning smoothly whoever might be the actual holders of power by one which would be unworkable in any hand but its own.

The Romans solved the problem in their own way. The sovereignty of the community as a whole ('populus') remained unimpaired, and the existing organs of the constitution continued to perform their functions; but the **Roman solution of a modern problem** the **populus** delegated to the plebs—the whole to the part—a co-ordinate power of legislation; and to the officials of that corporation a concurrent right of initiating measures binding on the **populus**. This dual system continued throughout the history of the Republic, and is reflected in the terminology of public acts. The assemblies of the whole people were named 'comitia' in strict parlance; those of the plebs were only 'concilia' (meetings). The acts of the people were the only laws ('leges'); the plebs passed resolutions ('scita'), though these were of universal validity, and the patricians, though not summoned to the

gatherings in which they were enacted, were forced to obey them.

How did this come about? Tradition speaks with no doubtful voice of a series of secessions, in which the plebs withdrew from the community, set up its own organization by tribes and elected its own officers ('tribuni'). The last of these, by means of which it finally established its right to legislate for the people, took place in 287 B.C., and the facts cannot reasonably be questioned. The first, in which the tribunate was instituted, is dated as early as 494 B.C., but there is no agreement either as to the position occupied by the seceders, or as to the number of tribunes elected. In any case, the full college of ten members dates from the middle of the century. Besides these officers, the plebs also appointed two temple wardens ('aediles'), whose original function was to keep the archives of the corporation in the temple of Ceres.

The immediate object of the plebs was to secure the common citizen against the arbitrary exercise of the undefined and almost unlimited authority ('imperium') which was vested in the magistrates of the Roman people.

With this end in view, the tribunes were instructed to 'furnish succour' ('ferre auxilium') to any individual who invoked their aid; and in order to give the necessary sanction of force to this power, the plebs bound itself by oath to slay anyone who laid hands on its officers and hindered them in the exercise of their duties. That this permanent threat of lynch law was the true basis on which the 'sacrosanctity' of the tribunes rested cannot reasonably be doubted; but the constitutionalists of later times would have it that the sanction was embodied in a law which enacted that he who offered violence to a tribune should be 'sacer Jovi,' devoted to Jupiter, that is, as a sin-offering, or in other words an outlaw from the community whose slaying was no murder. According to some authorities, the aediles of the plebs were likewise sacrosanct.

The next step was to secure the codification and promulgation of the law administered by the magistrates of the people. According to Livy the plebs resolved to

appoint a commission for this purpose as early as 462 B.C., but met with bitter opposition on the part of the patres, and it was only after several years of strife that the ruling caste consented to the framing of a code. First of all, three envoys were sent to Greece to gather information concerning the laws in use in the Greek communities, especially those of Solon; and after their return the constitution was temporarily suspended and the supreme magistracy replaced by a Commission of Ten ('decemviri'), whose decisions were not subject to appeal. Its members were all patrician, and it carried out the task imposed on it within the year, embodying the laws in Ten Tables which were submitted to the people for confirmation. But—so the story goes—a second board of Ten was appointed for the following year, which, though it contained two plebeian members, added amongst other laws (bringing the number of tables up to twelve) a provision forbidding 'conubium' (that is, the contraction of a marriage making the issue Roman citizens) between patricians and plebeians, and acted so oppressively that it was overthrown by a popular rising, connected in legend with the famous episode of Virginia; and a constitutional settlement took place in 449 B.C., under the consulship of Valerius and Horatius, which formed a landmark in the early history of Rome. The new code came into force in the following year.

Some modern scholars have cast doubts on the antiquity and authenticity of the Laws of the Twelve Tables, suggesting that the story of their promulgation arose from the projection into the past of the action of Gnaeus Flavius, who in 304 B.C. made public the forms of legal procedure to which strict adherence was obligatory on all suitors. Less radical critics, laying stress on the fact that according to Livy the original tables were destroyed when Rome was burnt by the Gauls, believe that the text current in later historical times contained material of various dates and had in course of transmission been modernised in substance as well as in language. The laws were, in fact, used as a text-book in schools, and Cicero tells

us that he learnt them as a 'carmen necessarium'—a compulsory recitation.

This attitude of scepticism is unjustifiable. The mixture of highly archaic maxims of law with advanced provisions concerning, for example, marriage and inheritance, is remarkable, but finds its explanation in the circumstances under which the code was promulgated. What the plebeians demanded was the recognition by the state of the customs which they practised, as creating valid legal relations, and this they succeeded in obtaining. Where such questions did not arise, the legislators, with due Roman respect for the past, gave their sanction to immemorial customs such as find their parallels amongst all primitive peoples. This naturally shows itself especially in the field of criminal law:

*If one breaks another's limb and fails to come to agreement [for compensation], let limb be given for limb. Thou shalt not charm away thy neighbour's corn from his field. If one steals by night, and another kill him, he shall be deemed rightly slain.*

The man who reaped his neighbour's corn by night, if caught, was to be hanged 'as an offering to Ceres.' The use of an 'evil song,' which the lawyers took to mean a libel on a citizen's good fame, but which must surely refer to 'black magic,' was visited with the capital penalty.

The law of debt, again, is brutal in its harshness. Thirty days are allowed for payment of a debt which a court has declared to be due:

*After that, he (the creditor) shall have the right to lay hands on him and hale him into court. If he shall not satisfy the claim and no surety be found, the creditor shall take him with him and bind him with thongs or fetters weighing fifteen pounds—no heavier, lighter if he will. If he will, the debtor shall live at his own charge. If not, he who keeps him bound shall give him a pound of meal a day; he may give more if he will.*

The debtor remained in bondage for sixty days, in the course of which he was thrice led on market-day to the place of assembly, and the amount of his debt proclaimed, in order that a chance might be given him of finding sureties. 'On the third market-day they (the creditors) shall carve him in pieces.' That this startling provision means what it says

the Romans of later times have no doubt, though they add that in practice it was not enforced (as we may well believe), but that the debtor was sold 'across the Tiber,' since no citizen might be made a slave on Roman soil.

But beside these archaic enactments we find in the Code the explicit recognition of principles adapted to the needs of a growing and thriving community. In the private law of Rome the only person possessing a full legal personality was the 'paterfamilias' (see page 1644). We naturally think of him in the first instance under the aspect of fatherhood. The 'patria potestas,' of which the Romans spoke as an institution peculiar to themselves (though Caesar found something like it, as he

The 'Patria Potestas' tells us, among the a Roman institution

Gauls), suggests to us the 'power of life and death' exercised by the father over his descendants (for all that it implied see Chapter 78), which, though limited by custom and sentiment, survived throughout Roman history and was never abolished—a son was executed by his father for taking part in the conspiracy of Catiline. But this despotic authority over the members of the family was in fact only a means to the end which early Roman law and custom had in view—the preservation of the unity, solidarity and perpetuity of the household and its goods. But if the system based upon the patria potestas was retained by the patrician families, the plebs had long outgrown it, and the Twelve Tables recognized their customs. Their testamentary dispositions took the form of a transfer of the 'familia' by a fictitious sale in which the purchaser acted as an executor and carried out the wishes expressed by the testator, and the law now gave him complete freedom of bequest and of the appointment of guardians. Again, the release of a son from the patria potestas could be brought about by a thrice-repeated form of sale.

The new law looked favourably on the emancipation of slaves, and facilitated the purchase of freedom by a slave on the death of his master. Slavery in early Rome was of course a very different thing from the 'plantation' system of later times,

when scores of thousands of barbarian captives taken in the great wars of conquest or kidnapped from the slave markets of the Aegean were ruthlessly worked to death on the great estates of Italian landowners. The slave trade was as yet unknown, and the captive taken in the wars of Rome with her near neighbours was not a mere chattel, but in a real sense belonged to the 'familia' and was admitted to the protection of its gods. On his liberation he became a Roman citizen, and there was, so far as we know, no restriction of his right in

**Early treatment  
of slaves**

private law to acquire property and with it the vote. If custom excluded slaves, at least in the first generation, from civic honours and from intermarriage with free-born Romans, they could found families which in the course of a few generations might win their way by the acquisition of fortune to a position equal with that of the Romans of pure descent.

This liberal treatment of alien elements did not escape the notice of Greek observers. In a letter written towards the end of the third century B.C. by Philip V, king of Macedon, to the town of Larissa in Thessaly, the king urges the people of that town to take example by the Romans and enlarge their citizen body by the same methods. True, in the later Republican period, when the character of the servile population was rapidly changing, there was some restriction of the rights

of those manumitted by their owners, especially in the matter of voting power.

In the matter of marriage, the Code recognized the contract by consent which was practised by the plebeian community. This did not bring the woman under the 'potestas' of her husband as did the ancient form (for details refer to Chapter 78), unless he acquired it by prescription ('usus'), which could be broken by an absence of three nights during the year, or by fictitious purchase ('coemptio'). Thus the ancient form of the patriarchal family to which the patricians clung had side by side with it another more in keeping with the progressive spirit of the time.

The sumptuary laws of the Tenth Table (which are said to have been based on those of Solon) deal largely with the expense of funeral ceremonies, one of the chief luxuries on which ancient aristocracies expended their wealth with a view to demonstrating their social importance. The hiring of troops of mourners, the lavish use of unguents, the placing of crowns (other than such as the deceased had won as the reward of valour) on the pyre and the burying of gold ('unless,' as the law quaintly adds, 'in the stoppings of teeth') are forbidden.

The enactments which did most to satisfy the claims of the plebs were those which guaranteed to the citizen a right of appeal ('provocatio') to the popular assembly from the sentence of a magistrate. Tradition says that the first law which created



TYPE OF THE FUNERALS RESTRICTED BY THE TEN TABLES

One of the sumptuary enactments of the Ten Tables restricted expenditure on funerary ceremonies. What these ceremonies had been like, and why it was deemed provident to curb them, may be gathered from Etruscan tomb paintings; for according to a statement of Appian (probably correct) Roman customs in these matters were derived from Etruria. In the painting above, from the Tomba delle Iscrizioni, we see athletes wrestling to the sound of the flute and an equestrian procession.

From Poulsen, 'Etruscan Tomb Paintings,' Clarendon Press

this right was also the first to be enacted by the people in the Year One of the Republic on the proposal of the first consul, Valerius Publicola; but this may be mythical. The Twelve Tables, at all events, made frequent mention of the right; Cicero tells us that they provided an appeal 'from every judgement or penalty.' Moreover, they laid down that no capital sentence—none, that is to say, which affected the 'caput,' or civil personality, of the citizen—should be pronounced except by the 'greatest assembly,' which was the nation in arms; and further, that there should be no 'privilegia' (i.e. Bills of Pains and Penalties) directed against a named individual. After the fall of the Decemvirate (which as an extra-constitutional body had enjoyed absolute jurisdiction) the people passed a law forbidding the creation of any such magistracy in the future, and the plebs passed a similar resolution in its own assembly.

It is necessary, however, to remember that the sphere within which the citizen could exercise his right was limited by the first milestone.

**Right of appeal and its limitations** Within that radius he was 'at home'; beyond it he was 'on active service,' and therefore under military discipline; also, that when a dictator (of whom we shall speak in Chapter 62) was appointed, martial law was set up even within the walls of the city. Nor was there any effective sanction, save public opinion, for the enforcement of the law against a magistrate, though of course the 'auxilium' of the tribune might give protection in an emergency.

We embark upon a difficult question when we consider the steps by which the corporation of the plebs gained for its resolutions the validity of law. In the traditional version of the restoration of constitutional government in 449 B.C., under the consulship of Valerius and Horatius, mention is made of a law with this effect. In Livy's words, 'since it was a matter of dispute in law whether the patricians were bound by the resolutions of the plebs, they passed a law in the assembly of the centuries, to the effect that ordinances made by the plebs in its tribes should be binding on the

people; by which law a powerful weapon was placed at the disposal of the measures proposed by tribunes.' The statement is positive and unambiguous, and in fact we find that a law (to mention no other measures) was carried by a tribune, Canuleius, four years later permitting conubium between the orders, which, as we saw, the decemvirs had forbidden (see page 1648). It is therefore strange to find that in 339 B.C. a plebeian dictator is represented as passing a law that 'the resolutions of the plebs should be binding on all Roman citizens,' and that in 287 B.C. a final enactment, which bore the name of another plebeian dictator, Hortensius, settled the question once and for all.

Modern writers have solved the problem in a variety of ways, the more radical critics being disposed to reject the earlier laws as apocryphal, while others would at-

**Divergent accounts of the Constitutional Reform**

tach to the earlier measures limiting conditions (such as the consent of the Senate or confirmation by the 'populus') which would stultify the essential feature of the reform. We may be reasonably sceptical as to the account which Livy gives of the constitutional settlement of 449 B.C., which seems to be inspired by the desire of the jurists of a much later age to represent the growth of Roman institutions as taking place in an orderly manner and to obscure the revolutionary side of the process. For example, we are told that the appointment of ten tribunes after the suspension of the office during the decemvirate was made in an assembly of the people presided over by the Pontifex Maximus, who would surely have been the last person to perform such a function; unfortunately Cicero and Livy fail to agree as to the name of the chief pontiff in question! Similarly, the lawyers are probably to be held responsible for a statute assigned to the same consuls protecting the inviolability of the tribunes by enacting that those who did violence to them should be devoted to Jupiter and their property forfeited to the temple of Ceres—an attempt (as was suggested above) to substitute a law of the populus for the oath of the plebs as the guarantee of sacrosanctity.

We are therefore tempted to regard the law concerning 'plebiscita' in the same light, though it may well be that the people now gave formal recognition to the existence of the corporation of the plebs as one capable of framing ordinances binding upon itself. The patres might well concede so much while contesting the validity of such ordinances so far as they affected themselves. We find, in fact, that some of the most important plebiscita of the following period were not in fact observed, especially those concerning the qualification for the chief magistracy. The plebs could not be fitted logically into the framework of the old constitution, but it was characteristic of the Romans to allow the old and the new gradually to find their 'modus vivendi,' and in course of time the revolutionary character of the plebeian institutions ceased to have any practical significance.

There remained yet one, and that the most important, position which the plebs sought to conquer—access to the magistracy, especially the supreme office of the consulship, with the tremendous powers comprised in the 'imperium,' of which we shall speak later. Here the patres made their final stand. Rather than surrender their exclusive right to the chief magistracy they resorted in most years to the expedient of suspending it, and entrusting its functions to a certain number (normally six) of the staff officers named tribuni militum, 'with consular powers'—one of the legal fictions of which the Romans made such ingenious use to evade breaches of continuity.

Even so, scarcely any plebeians were elected to this office before 400 B.C., when the tide began to turn, and in 399 B.C. the plebs secured a majority in the College. About the same time we first meet with the name of a plebeian among the senators. The minor office of the quaestorship, which could be thrown open without sacrifice of principle, had already been held by a plebeian in 409 B.C. In seventy-seven years 'consular tribunes' were elected on fifty-one occasions, and it was not until 367 B.C. that the plebs secured the passing of a law that one of the two

consuls should be plebeian. The traditional version is that the tribunes Licinius and Sextius secured the passage of the law by coupling with it certain measures of social reform, one giving relief to debtors by providing that interest already paid on borrowed money should be deducted from the principal and the balance rendered in three annual instalments, and the other dealing with the agrarian problem by limiting the right to occupy vacant public land and to pasture cattle and sheep thereon. The authenticity of this last, which is said to have fallen into desuetude and to have been re-enacted more than two centuries later by Tiberius Gracchus, has been disputed by modern critics, but without sufficient reason.

In any case the name of L. Sextius appears in a list of consuls in the year 366 B.C. as the 'first from the plebs.' We hear less of him than of his colleague, C. Licinius Stolo, of whom the story is told that his wife belonged to the patrician house of the Fabii, and that the social indignities to which her mésalliance exposed her spurred him on to claim for his fellow plebeians access to the highest honours in the state. Whether true or not, the story bears witness to the fact that social barriers were being broken down by the intermarriage of patrician with plebeian families, and that a 'liberal' group was in process of formation among the patres.

To this group, no doubt, belonged the Aemilii, Servilii and Sulpicii, who are represented in the consular lists of the six years which followed the Licinio-Sextian reforms. A reaction seems to have followed, for no member of these families held office during the next eighteen years, and in the course of that time the Licinian law was violated seven times by the election of two patrician consuls, a fact which tends to confirm the suggestion made above that during this period the patres still contested the validity of 'plebiscita.' Nevertheless, the process by which their privileges were curtailed or abolished suffered no serious check.

When the consulship was first thrown open to the plebs, some compensation was offered to the patricians in the creation of

#### The Struggle for the Consulship

#### Intermarriage as a levelling agency

two fresh offices, that of the praetor, whose duty it was to administer law to the citizens, and that of the so-called 'curule' aediles, modelled on the wardens of the plebs. It was understood that these were to be reserved for patricians, and the praetorship was not in fact held by a plebeian until 337 B.C.; but almost from the first we find the aediles taken in alternate years from patricians and plebeians. In 356 B.C. one of the leading plebeians, C. Marcius Rutilus, became dictator and five years later censor.

In 339 B.C. Publius Philo, the second plebeian to become dictator, passed a law prescribing that at least one censor should be plebeian, as well as a measure of greater importance which deprived the *patres*, in the narrower sense of the term, namely, the patrician members of the Senate, of their privileges of ratifying the acts of the assembled people. The 'authority of the *patres*,' as it was called, had once been the crowning act in the legislative process, signifying the approval of the leaders of the people and depositaries of the traditions which were as sacred to the Romans as the law. But as the plebeian element in the Senate grew and the patrician families one by one became extinct or drifted into obscurity, the utterance of the remnant lost all political significance, and it was now enacted that the expression of the *patres'* approval should be given before the votes of the people were taken, and this formality continued to be observed even in the times of Cicero.

It is interesting to observe, with reference to the disappearance of patrician families, that out of

**Gradual extinction of Patricians** somewhat more than seventy patrician gentes whose names are known to us, only twenty-four are represented in the lists of magistrates (so far as our materials enable us to compile them) in the period following the Licinio-Sextian reforms. Of these only six survived in the reign of Augustus.

Finally, the plebs made good its claim to a share in those priestly offices which were of importance in the domain of public and private law. In 300 B.C., two tribunes, Quintus and Gaius Ogulnius, carried a law increasing the number of pontiffs


and augurs to nine each, and providing that five of the former and four of the latter should always be plebeian. It is, however, noteworthy that the Board of Ten whose duty was to keep and when necessary consult the Sibylline Oracles (that is, to supervise the introduction of Greek religious cults), was partly plebeian as constituted by one of the Licinio-Sextian laws of 367 B.C. This was because it did not concern the ancient religion of the patrician state. The patrician 'die-hards,' as we gather from Livy, brought forward the old arguments—the 'auspices' were theirs alone; they only had true gentes; lawful 'authority' (imperium) at home and abroad belonged only to them. But Decius Mus evoked the memory of his father, whose voluntary self-sacrifice had gained the victory for Rome in the Latin war, and the measure was carried by a huge majority.

Thirteen years after the promulgation of the law of Quintus and Gaius Ogulnius, the 'struggle of the orders' was finally composed by the Hortensian law, passed in

consequence of the last 'secession' of the plebs, which made that body a second sovereign. Rome had solved her problem without the bloody strife of faction which so many Greek cities were unable to avoid; the pages of her history are not stained with such episodes as the massacre of Corcyra which moved Thucydides to write the terrible indictment of his countrymen which we read in his third book. There was never a body of exiles plotting to re-enter their native city with foreign aid and to drive their opponents in turn into banishment. To patrician and plebeian alike the public cause ('res publica') came first.

Rome had become in form a democracy, if by that we mean a state in which (at any rate in theory) 'that which concerns all is decided by all' and in which equality of rights has taken the place of exclusive privilege. But equality of rights does not bring with it equality of opportunities, and the liberation of new forces was bound to raise fresh and more difficult problems of adjustment. The failure to solve them involved the fall of the Republic.





#### CARTHAGE'S GREATEST SON AND ROME'S MOST FORMIDABLE FOE

Hannibal (c. 246-183 B.C.), son of Hamilcar Barca, devoted his life to wreaking vengeance on Rome for her implacable hostility to Carthage. Although his life purpose was ultimately defeated, the failure has left his glory undimmed, and as a military genius—a master both of strategy and of tactics and a commander with magnetic personality—he ranks with Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar and Napoleon. This bust, probably an idealised portrait, was found at Capua.

*Naples Museum; photo, Alinari*

# HISTORY'S MOST GLORIOUS FAILURE

Study of Hannibal his Character and Strategy  
as revealed in the Epic Struggle with Rome

By CAPTAIN B. H. LIDDELL HART

Author of *A Greater than Napoleon—Scipio Africanus, Great Captains Unveiled, etc.*

It is the year 238 B.C. Before the altar of Baal-Moloch in the city of Carthage stands the great general Hamilcar Barca, offering sacrifice for the success of the expedition which he is about to lead into Spain by way of the Strait of Gibraltar. Few who watch him have any insight into the ultimate motive, stupendous in idea and in consequence, which is driving him into this self-imposed exile. Perhaps its significance is revealed, by instinct, most to the nine-year-old boy who stands near him, a boy whose features tell the relationship of the two by a similarity rare even between father and son.

For Hannibal—the 'Grace of Baal'—had been born in the later years of the First Punic War, when Hamilcar was about to begin that heroic guerrilla struggle in which, during six years, he strove to preserve Sicily from the Romans, only to be thwarted by lack of support from war-weary Carthage. Hannibal's early childhood had been filled with impressions of mingled pride and shame—with the epic glory of his father's fight against odds which alone brightened with honour the gloom of material losses, with the bitterness which springs from undeserved defeat, and with the sense that military genius had disclosed a potential counterpoise to the traditional sea supremacy which Carthage had forfeited.


At the end of the ceremony, Hamilcar called his young son forward and, out of earshot of the other worshippers, asked him whether he would like to accompany the expedition to Spain. At Hannibal's eager assent, his father led him up to the altar and, making him lay his hand upon the sacrifice, bade him swear an oath of lifelong enmity to Rome. Then, their

blood tie reinforced by a blood oath of still deeper significance, the two prepared to set out from a mother city which the father was never to see again, the son only after thirty-six years. And the blood of that sacrifice was the symbol of the blood of hundreds of thousands which was to be poured out in the vain fulfilment of that oath. To understand it, the Old Testament is a better guide than the classics, for these men were of a Semitic race, strange blend of the spiritual and material, and the binding force of a Semitic oath is portrayed in many passages, of terrible sublimity, in the Old Testament. Racial, too, was the tenacity of purpose, the patient impersonal pursuit of vengeance, carried to a pitch and prolonged to a span without match in the history of man.

Twenty years have passed. The scene has changed to the ramparts of Italy, those towering Alpine battlements which, seen from Turin, seem to fall sheer to the rich plain of the Po, which they protect. On a wide bare platform between two peaks, a stage raised by nature—probably the Col du Clapier—is assembled a horde of awe-inspiring as their setting. Faces wolfish from hunger and pinched from cold, ragged dress and variety of equipment, may give them a tatterdemalion air, accentuated by their mixture of races—Spanish and African foot, Numidian cavalry on their desert-bred horses, Balearic slingers and a sprinkling of fair-skinned Gauls. But their very assortment appears to symbolise the threatened racial encirclement of Rome, and the presence of such an army in such a situation, poised above the plains of Italy, adds to their terrifying appearance.

With dramatic instinct, Hannibal summons his men together, and points to the view unfurled beneath them—in that clear atmosphere, as mountain climbers know, it would seem but a few steps down. 'A battle, perhaps two,' and Rome, the goal, would be in their grasp. The scene signifies not only the imagination which, coupled with vengeance, was the great driving force of Hannibal, but also his use of it as a moral tonic to his men, one of the secrets of his extraordinary power in welding this cosmopolitan collection of mercenaries into a matchless tool for his genius. For him the view symbolised Rome beneath him, for them it symbolised a limitless vista of booty; but his own imagination could also evoke a response from theirs to the grandeur of sharing in such a venture and playing for such colossal stakes.

What a gamble it was! Those who saw the view were little more than half the number who, crossing first the Pyrenees and then the Rhône, had begun that arduous climb up the western slopes of the Alps. Difficult as had been the passage of the precipitous and roadless gorges for an army—with all its horses, pack-animals and elephants—the obstacles of nature were less than the obstacles of men. For, as the snake-like column dragged its endless tail round mountain spurs and along the face of precipices, it was repeatedly assailed by the mountain tribes. And now the descent, if unopposed, had to overcome the treachery of snow and ice; in one place Hannibal had to halt his half-frozen and half-starved men and beasts for three days while a road was made for the elephants. What power of leadership must have radiated from this young man of twenty-nine to carry his heterogeneous army of mercenaries so far from their homes, to make them dare such perils when their blood was chilled and their minds oppressed by the unknown—not



PLAN OF THE BATTLE OF TRASIMENE

The road passing north of Lake Trasimene is hemmed between the hills and the shore. Hannibal blocked the exit on the east and posted troops in ambush in the hills; when the Romans had entered from the west his Numidian cavalry swept down behind them, and they were in a complete trap.

least in physical conditions so strange to men accustomed to the genial southern warmth of Africa and Spain. When they at last stood on the plains of Italy, they mustered only 20,000 foot and 6,000 horse—a mere handful to invade a state which, fighting on its own ground, had a quarter of a million men listed for service among its citizens and allies, and thrice that number capable of bearing arms.

Yet, if the physical odds were so heavily with Rome, Hannibal had a counterpoise which has been too often under-rated by historians. For he pitted his military genius against commanders who knew only the drill but not the art of war—scorning it as Punic deceit—and he brought a superbly-trained professional army against short-service citizen levies. That he ultimately failed in a trial of quality against quantity where Alexander had succeeded was because he had to meet Romans, not Persians, men who stiffened instead of dissolving under pressure, and because he gave them time to learn the art of war and so balance the deficit of quality.

Two years later. It is the evening of Cannae. The victim lies prone beneath the sword, stretched helpless to all appearance on the altar, awaiting the consummation of the sacrifice. Yet the blade does not fall. Why? That is still an enigma.

Since Hannibal entered Italy he has defeated the Roman armies in three great battles. First at the Trebia, where he had

not only drawn the enemy to battle break-fast on a bitter winter day, but had hidden a picked body of troops in the sunken bed of a stream—to emerge and strike the Romans in the rear when they were spent from hunger and the strain of resisting the direct attack, and the more vulnerable because of the rout of their cavalry. Then at Lake Trasimenus in the spring of 217 B.C.; here, after slipping past the army of Flaminius, which blocked the road to Rome, he prepared for his pursuers an ambush which, in art and scope, has no match in history. Concealing his troops overnight on the hills which bordered the lake, he waited until the Roman army, in hot pursuit, was pressing along the lake shore in the early morning, and then at a signal his troops, sweeping down from the mist-wreathed slopes, blocked both ends of the defile—as a prelude to a battle that, morally and mentally won before it began, became a massacre.

The road to Rome lay open to Hannibal, with barely a hundred miles to go, and with no formed army at hand to oppose him. But instead of marching south he turned east towards the Adriatic shore, ravaging the country, giving his men their fill of booty and putting to the sword all inhabitants capable of bearing arms. Some discount this story because it comes, like all we know of Hannibal, from

racial enemies; yet they relate many instances of his chivalry and the very fact that they contrast this action with that of Pyrrhus, the last overseas invader, suggests its authenticity. If true, it not only shows us Hannibal slaking his thirst for vengeance—he was still youthful enough to find satisfaction in such physical retribution—but perhaps yields a clue to a deeper problem, his turning aside from the goal. For this the military reason often advanced is that his army, essentially equipped for mobile warfare—like an athlete stripped for a race—had no siege train. It may be true, for although there is no direct proof the repulse of his attempt to take Spoletum in passing is perhaps indirect evidence.

But beyond this there would seem to be a political reason—which, incidentally, casts doubt on the Roman account of the massacre and rapine that attended Hannibal's march. Since crossing the Alps he had conducted a ceaseless and subtle propaganda, its keynote that 'he was not come to fight against Italians, but on behalf of Italians against Rome.' Consistently he had released without ransom all prisoners who were not Romans, seeking thus to detach from Rome her allies. With his first military successes many of the Gallic tribes north of the Po

**Propaganda to win the Italian states**



**LAKE TRASIMENUS, WHERE HANNIBAL DESTROYED A ROMAN ARMY**

When in 217 B.C. Hannibal advanced towards Rome, having broken all resistance north of the Apennines, he first avoided the main Roman army under the consul Caius Flaminius, and then forced it to engage on the shores of this 'Trasimene Lake' (modern Lago Trasimeno). Hannibal's choice of position enabled the Carthaginians to win a sweeping victory, since the greater part of Flaminius's forces was trapped between the lake and the hills and cut to pieces, only the vanguard escaping.


had come over to his banner, but he had still to gain the alliance of the Italian states. It is well to remember that, if his route from Trasimenus took him away from Rome, it took him towards his allies. His army was a mercenary coalition and he now aimed to expand and secure it through the achievement of a political coalition—his policy that of the racial encirclement of Rome.

But as, beyond the military reason, we found a political reason, so beyond the political was there perhaps a spiritual reason? This matter, however, may more suitably be treated when we have examined Hannibal's subsequent movements. Granted a respite after Trasimenus, the Romans, now awake to the imminence of the menace, appointed a Dictator, Fabius, who adopted a strategy henceforth to be linked with his name for all time, a strategy of wearing down the enemy's strength by avoiding battle. Time was on his side. Dogging Hannibal's footsteps persistently, keeping to the hills where Hannibal could not bring his cavalry superiority into play, cutting off stragglers and foraging parties, he remained an elusive shadow on the horizon, dimming the glory of Hannibal's triumphal progress. Thus Fabius, by his very presence and immunity from defeat, thwarted Hannibal's moral suasion over the minds of the Italian allies. To check them from joining Hannibal was a far greater result than that, more commonly acclaimed by historians, of giving Rome breathing space—for Hannibal himself allowed this to Rome.

Attrition strategy, however, is not only a blunt but a two-edged weapon, and is apt to injure those who wield it through the moral depression and strain which it involves. When, after six months, the tenure of Fabius expired, Rome was almost compelled by the devastation of the lands of her allies to relieve the strain by a reversion to direct

action. If the instinct was right, the execution was faulty, and the new consuls allowed themselves to be drawn to battle on the cavalry arena afforded by the coastal plain of the Adriatic. Here, on the field of Cannae, the greatest host Rome had ever brought into action—eight legions instead of the two of the usual consular army—was annihilated by Hannibal's art, particularly the skill with which he played his cavalry 'trump.'

As usual, the infantry were in the centre, the cavalry on the flanks, but the actual disposition was unconventional. For Hannibal pushed forward the Gauls and Spaniards who formed the centre of the infantry line, while holding back his African foot, posted at each end of the line. Thus the Gauls and Spaniards formed a natural magnet for the Roman infantry and were, as intended, forced back and back, so that what had been a line bulging outwards became a line bulging inwards. Flushed with their success and eager to break through the enemy centre, the Roman legionaries crowded into the bulge and the press



#### DISPOSITION OF THE FORCES AT CANNAE

The description in Livy leaves little doubt as to the main course of the battle, but the exact terrain is uncertain. According to many authorities it was fought on the opposite (south) bank of the River Aufidus. The outstanding fact is the skill with which Hannibal tempted the Romans into his sagging line.

grew ever denser, until they could scarcely use their weapons. Thinking that they were pushing in the Carthaginian front, they were actually pushing themselves into a Carthaginian sack. For at this juncture Hannibal's African veterans wheeled inwards from both sides, and automatically took the thick press of the Romans in flank.

Meanwhile, the powerful assault of Hannibal's heavy cavalry on the left had broken the opposing cavalry on that wing and, sweeping round the

**Crushing Roman  
defeat at Cannae**

Roman rear, had dispersed the cavalry on the other wing, who had been held in play by the elusive Numidian horse. Leaving the pursuit to the Numidians, the heavy cavalry had then delivered the coup de grâce by bursting on the rear of the Roman foot, already surrounded on three sides and too tightly jammed to offer effective resistance. Thenceforward it was but a massacre.

That evening Maharbal, commander of the Numidian cavalry, urged an instant advance on Rome. According to Livy he declared: 'Send me on with the cavalry, follow on yourself, and in five days you shall feast in triumph in the Capitol.' Hannibal replied that he must take time for reflection, whereupon Maharbal bitterly exclaimed: 'You know how to win a victory, Hannibal, but not how to use one.'

If the truth of the remark be uncertain, there can be no denying that the opportunity offered itself. When the rumours of disaster reached Rome, there was panic among the people, if not among the Senate—but for its prompt and resolute action masses of the inhabitants would have fled the city. For the dread advance guard of Hannibal was expected hourly.

Why in this hour of supreme triumph does he abstain from attempting the consummation? His next efforts are directed to breaking up the Italian confederation, and the reward of his victory at Cannae comes in the first secessions of these states. His political object is clearly to continue building up a coalition against Rome. But why do this when Rome is stripped of her defenders, and

her allies, if they have not deserted her, are temporarily paralysed? An advance on Rome is not only the direct way to gain Rome, but the best and quickest way to hasten the secession of her Italian allies, for the news that Hannibal is at the gates of Rome, after destroying her army, will discourage any idea of intervention to avert her impending doom.

There must surely be a deeper explanation than any yet offered. What is the mainspring of Hannibal's whole career and campaigns? It is vengeance—Semitic vengeance, conceived on a scale and with a majesty of design far removed from a crude vendetta. Yet vengeance is a primitive instinct, and the fact that it is the governing motive of a great mind does not affect its nature, only its mode of execution. When primitive man takes revenge he does not dispatch the object of his hatred quickly, but prolongs the sufferings in order, by slow sips, to obtain the full flavour of the satisfaction of his instinct. The victim must not only pay for his misdeeds, but must know that he is paying. Let us apply our knowledge of this primitive instinct to the study of Hannibal's mind.

To sweep down from the Alps and overwhelm Rome in a swift, Homeric conflict would enable the defeated to fall fighting in a blaze of glory. But

if Rome's armies could **Hannibal's dream**  
be one by one destroyed, **of epic vengeance**  
her allies turned to spurn

her, the fruits of her years of conquest gradually plucked from her, while she in pitiable weakness, and in the sight of all who had long feared her, awaited the inevitable end—what an epic vengeance!

Five years pass. Hannibal is riding up to the walls of Rome itself, leisurely surveying the city which has been his magnet since he took the vow of eternal enmity in Carthage twenty-seven years before. His coming has been announced by a flood of terror-stricken refugees from all the countryside and by the fiery beacons of hamlets given up to the flames. Within the walls there is the same panic, the same lamentations of women, as on the morrow of Cannae. But the Senate is equally resolute and far less moved. And Hannibal himself lets his eyes rest on the city,

not with the satisfied look of one who holds the prize in his hand, but with the wistful glance of him who makes a supreme act of renunciation. He casts his spear over the walls—symbol of defiance but also of futility—and a few days later turns his back on Rome itself, for ever.

After Cannae, many Italian cities had come over to him, led by Capua, the nearest rival of Rome in size and riches. From Capua south down the shin to the toe of Italy most of the land acknowledged his leadership. But, even here, numerous Latin colonies or Roman garrisons held out, and the heel as well as all the upper part of the leg of Italy was unshakably solid in fidelity to Rome. While the respite after Cannae enabled Rome to raise fresh levies to replace her lost legions, Hannibal's new allies accepted his help rather than tendered him theirs. And his

help was soon needed, for although the Romans were too wary to risk another pitched battle, four armies kept watch on him, harassing his detachments and confederates, as well as giving both moral and timely material aid to the fortresses which he threatened.

More ominous still, the Roman generals were learning the art of war from their master, and some of his pupils, Marcellus particularly, began to score points in these desultory exchanges. In 213 B.C., while Hannibal was away in the south besieging Tarentum, the Romans laid siege to Capua, and although Hannibal relieved it once, the Romans lured him away by a threat elsewhere and promptly returned to the siege. Their entrenched lines of circumvallation were soon so strong that a fresh and direct attempt at relief by Hannibal failed, and it was in a calculating



#### ITINERARY OF HANNIBAL'S 17 YEARS' CAMPAIGNING AGAINST ROME

After capturing Saguntum in 219 B.C. Hannibal crossed the Pyrenees and marched along the south coast of Gaul, and turning inland at the Rhône crossed the Alps. Successive victories on the Ticinus and the Trebia, at Lake Trasimene and Cannae followed, after which he established himself at Capua. Thereafter he traversed Italy in all directions, and after the defeat of Hasdrubal on the Metaurus Jr. 207 B.C., maintained himself in the peninsula of Bruttium until 203, when he was recalled to Africa.

but desperate effort at indirect relief that, in 211 B.C., he marched on Rome. But the opposing generals, both before Capua and in Rome, were not deceived by this strategic bluff, and, maintaining the siege, detached only a small part of the besieging force as a stiffening to the ample new levies in Rome.

In an age when the strategic art was still far behind the tactical, which Hannibal himself had raised to the highest level in all history, this far-reaching manoeuvre of his was a landmark in the evolution of strategy, and the very fact that it failed of its purpose testified not merely to that supreme level-headedness which was the hall-mark of the Romans, but also to the progress of their military education.

Soon, one of them, graduating in the Hannibalic school of war, was to retort by a stroke of strategy more original than any

Hannibal had tried. After Carthage falls Capua had fallen—to be to lead support made an awful warning against desertion of Rome—

Hannibal's sole hope lay in support from his own people. Carthage had sent him only the most meagre reinforcements, although, strangely enough, she had been liberal in furnishing troops for Spain and even for Sicily. She was a 'nation of tradesmen,' and while she could appreciate the value of war as a means to new markets or resources, she had no thirst either for empire or revenge, except as a by-product. Moreover, she was divided by faction, and there was a powerful 'peace party' whose policy was dictated as much by a personal feud with the Barcine party as by distrust of their 'imperialistic' designs. When Hannibal sent a message by Mago for reinforcements, his opponents turned his words as an argument against his request:

'I have slain the armies of the enemy; send me soldiers.' What else would you ask if you had been conquered? 'I have captured two of the enemy's camps full of booty and provisions; supply me with corn and money.' What else would you ask if you had been plundered and stripped of your own camp?

Thus, they excused themselves for withholding the men and supplies which might have sealed the fate of Rome and averted their own. The Romans were


right to term it the Hannibalic war rather than the Second Punic War—for it was a duel between a man and a nation.

In default of direct support from home, Hannibal's remaining hope lay in reinforcements from his Spanish base. But here the Romans intervened. No diversion was ever better justified, whatever the apparent Scipio Africanus breach of the principle of to the Rescue concentration, than the action of Rome in maintaining large armies in Spain while she was fighting for her life on her own soil. The brothers Publius and Gnaeus Scipio were successful during the crucial years in keeping the Carthaginians so fully occupied in Spain that it was out of the question to send troops to Hannibal in Italy. True, in 212 B.C., the year before Capua fell, the Scipios were defeated and killed. This was perhaps the darkest hour for Rome since Cannae, for in Italy she and her allies were feeling acutely the strain of the incessant struggle. But the twenty-four years old son of Publius Scipio, who had distinguished himself in preserving the remnants of the Roman army after Cannae, volunteered, when his seniors held back, to take the command in Spain.

By a brilliant march and a 'coup de main,' he seized Cartagena, the main Carthaginian base in Spain, under the noses of three hostile armies, and thus debarred them from transporting reinforcements to Italy by the direct and comparatively simple sea route. But although he was too weak to prevent Hasdrubal, Hannibal's brother, from leaving Spain next year by the land route, it was with such a small fragment of the Carthaginian forces that Hasdrubal had to tarry in Gaul to recruit and reorganize, losing two vital years before he at last pushed on into Italy, in 207 B.C. By then Hannibal's situation had changed for the worse, and though still undefeatable, he was gradually being hemmed into an ever narrowing area in the south of Italy, like a lion in the bush by the encircling beaters.

Hannibal is in camp at Canusium, a few miles from the battlefields of Cannae. Facing him is the camp of the army under the consul Nero. Hannibal's outposts see a party emerge from the Roman camp;





**CARTHAGENA : SITE CHOSEN BY THE CARTHAGINIANS FOR A COLONY IN SPAIN**

In pursuance of Hamilcar's designs for the extension of Carthaginian influence in Spain, Hasdrubal established a new trading base on the south-east coast. This settlement, which was called New Carthage (and became Carthago), was situated on a bay affording capacious, and easily defensible harbours that closely resembled those of Carthage itself, and rapidly developed into a wealthy emporium. It was stormed and carried with great slaughter by Scipio in 210 B.C. Here we see modern Carthago ; in the foreground is the Aresenal Basin, thought to be this harbour originally used by the Carthaginians.

*Photo, E.N.A.*

as they come closer they are seen to be prisoners, chained and under escort; a little closer and they are recognized as Africans. Then one of the escort advances and throws a human head on the ground before returning. Curious as to the significance of this by-play, the Carthaginian outposts pick up the head and take it to Hannibal—who recognizes the marred features as those of his brother. It is the first news that he has had that Hasdrubal was even in Italy, and a cruel repayment of the honours he had always paid to his own fallen antagonists. Soon two of the captives, released for the purpose, arrive to give him a full account of the disaster.

The messengers sent by Hasdrubal to tell Hannibal of his arrival in Italy, and of his plans, had traversed the whole length of Italy safely, only to miss Hannibal, owing to one of his frequent changes of position, and fall into the hands of Nero. Thereupon Nero had resolved upon a bold cast, and leaving part of his force still facing Hannibal, had gone north by forced marches to join the other consul in a concentrated blow against Hasdrubal. In seven days

and nights he covered some 250 miles, defeating Hasdrubal at the Metaurus by a brilliantly conceived and executed transfer of force from one flank to another—and marched back quicker than he had come, so that he was again with his whole army facing Hannibal a fortnight after he had silently slipped away.

Hannibal, recognizing that his last hope of conquest has vanished; quits the scene of his supreme triumph nine years before, and falls back to Bruttium, the toe of Italy, there to stand at bay for another five years. He has been outwitted at last by men who were tiro in strategy nine years before, masked by a shadow while his opponent was carrying out a strategic manoeuvre more far-reaching than any he has ever conceived—one unsurpassed for two thousand years—and made possible by the mobility of the highly trained Roman armies which Hannibal's campaigns had converted from citizen levies into expert professional troops. Only when he is present are the Roman arms still powerless. For sixteen years he has marched and countermarched in a hostile country, supported only by his




LINEAMENTS OF SCIPIO AFRICANUS, THE VICTOR OF ZAMA

None of the extant portrait busts of Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus 'the Elder' is known to have been made during his life; but a considerable number are accepted as authentic likenesses of this great Roman general. The best are a marble bust in the Capitoline Museum and a dark green basalt bust, shown here full face and in profile, now in the Palazzo Rospigliosi, in Rome. It was found at Lyternum, near Cumae, his native country seat, where Scipio spent the last years of his life.

From Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie*

own exertions, yet making the war support itself—a feat without parallel in history. To have held his mercenary and heterogeneous band together through the perils of the Alps and the march into the heart of Italy was remarkable; but as a testimony to the unique force of his leadership in war it was nothing compared with the manner in which he held their devotion, so that none offered to betray or desert him, through fourteen years of fading fortune. And he quitted the land without molestation, the Roman armies daring no more than to follow him down to the shore at a respectful distance.

Hannibal's vigil of revenge in Italy was ended by an urgent recall to Africa to save Carthage from the rising star of Scipio. For Scipio, after conquering Spain and destroying there the whole fabric of Carthaginian dominion which Hamilcar had woven, had carried the war into Africa, defying the military wisecracks of the Senate who were still carrying on cautious and ineffective opera-



A TAME ELEPHANT

The Carthaginians probably learned the employment of Indian elephants in war from Pyrrhus; later they used the African variety, which seems to be figured on this Carthaginian relief.

tions against Hannibal. They argued, with the obstinacy of orthodoxy, that it was essential to concentrate all efforts against the main armed forces of the enemy—in Italy. Scipio preferred the more original strategy of manoeuvring against the enemy's rear. Annoyed at Scipio's presumption, his senatorial opponents not only sought to deprive him of command on a trumped up charge, but, foiled in this, took care to give him as little effective support as Carthage had given to his rival.

With two disgraced legions and a few thousand volunteers Scipio sailed from Sicily and confounded the prophets of gloom by making good his hold on African soil. With prudence balancing audacity, he first sought to secure a base and to weld his troops into a fighting force. Then he moved, shattered the field armies of Carthage and her African allies, and, before Hannibal could return, forced Carthage to sue for peace. But the news that Hannibal had landed encouraged Carthage to break the truce, and Scipio's position, isolated on foreign soil, looked as black as his opponents at home could wish.

By what was a masterly strategic move, however, he tilted the scales in his favour. Instead of falling back along the coast to his base, he advanced inland up the Bagradas Valley—a move which apparently isolated him still more. Actually, however, by this menace to the main source of supply for Carthage he compelled Hannibal to follow him to a battleground of his own choosing and, what was more, towards the Numidian reinforcements which were expected from his own recently won-over allies.

The shadows are lengthening on the battlefield of Zama—in the year 202 B.C. From behind a rampart of corpses advances a line of Roman legionaries, unexpectedly thin if also unexpectedly long, treading carefully to avoid slipping on the blood-soaked ground. Hannibal has been awaiting this moment all the long day of fighting. His 'Old Guard'



SYMBOL OF CARTHAGE MILITANT


Only the Carthaginians ever succeeded in breaking in the African elephant, a much more savage and intractable beast than the Asiatic species. As shown by its pointed ears, it is an African elephant that appears on this (enlarged) coin.

*British Museum*

of 24,000 veterans from Italy has been held well back in reserve, immobile and fretting while the battle raged before their eyes. They have seen the thunderous charge of the elephants nullified by Scipio's originality in leaving lanes between his cohorts down which the maddened beasts had taken the line of least resistance to themselves—and least damage to the Romans. They have caught glimpses through the dust clouds of the swirl of the cavalry fight on the wings, which has ended unfavourably to them, but also in the disappearance of both pursuers and pursued. They have stood and watched their first two infantry lines, composed of Gallic mercenaries and home levies, shattered and dispersed after a fierce struggle.

But the victors must surely have suffered severely and become disordered—their own chance would come for the decisive counterstroke. To their disgust, however, they see that Scipio has had the impudence under their very noses not only to reorganize but to change his dispositions, securely screened by the rampart of bodies, and in the knowledge that his opponents dared not risk disarranging their close-ranked formation by an advance over such corpse-littered ground. The Hannibalic host is still more astonished to see that Scipio is deploying his rear lines on the flanks of his first line. Surely he is mad to stake a single thin line against their deep mass, even though it gives him the momentary advantage of overlapping their flanks.

At last the Romans are coming—now they are clear of the barrier of dead—Hannibal gives the long awaited signal and his massive phalanx bears down on the slender Roman line. What if the mass be checked for a moment by the stream of missiles which that line can shower, owing to its extension—once the opposing ranks are at hand grips, weight must tell, and the lighter be pulverised. But the rearmost Carthaginian ranks



### PHASES OF THE BATTLE OF ZAMA

Scipio arranged his army in the usual Roman order but left wide lanes between the companies, down which the elephants with which Hannibal opened the battle charged without doing much damage (1). On the wings the Roman cavalry put the Carthaginian horse to flight and then returning attacked Hannibal's infantry in rear and caused a general rout (2).

hear the thunder of hoofs behind them—it is Scipio's cavalry returning from the pursuit, as he had calculated when making his novel disposition. The decisive manoeuvre of Cannae is repeated—but reversed, and the result also. Scipio has not only learnt Hannibal's art, but borrowed from him his most deadly instrument—superiority of cavalry.

A few weeks later; in the city of Carthage. The assembly is discussing the peace terms which Scipio has offered—unexpectedly moderate, as no extra penalties are exacted for the violated truce. Yet an orator, closing his eyes to the helplessness of Carthage, is advocating a continuance of the struggle. Hannibal, tired of listening to those who for sixteen years have merely made war with words, rises from his seat and pulls the speaker down. At a murmur from the assembly, Hannibal asks it ironically to pardon him if, after thirty-six years' service abroad, he has forgotten the etiquette of debate. Then he strongly urges it to accept the proffered terms.

For seven years he strives loyally to fulfil them, diverting his genius, as many-sided as Napoleon's, into new channels—the restoration of Carthage's prosperity

and the improvement of its administration, financial and judicial.

With the collapse of his scheme of vengeance, has the spirit which inspired it changed? Having learnt the futility of destruction, has he turned his energies to reconstruction as a worthier memorial of his genius, or merely as a means to an end—that of building up the material

designs a vast scheme for the conquest of Italy—that Antiochus should advance through Greece while he, with the loan of a force, goes to Carthage, to raise Africa against the oppressor, and then the two armadas converge on Italy. The jealousy and egoism of Antiochus make this scheme still-born, and soon Antiochus, the victim of his own vanity, is conquered in Asia

Minor by an invading Roman army. The Roman peace terms demand the surrender of Hannibal, but he escapes in time, first to Crete and ultimately to Bithynia, where the king, Prusias, promises him a safe refuge.

Dusk deepens into darkness. The house which Prusias had assigned to Hannibal some years before is encircled by a cordon of shadowy figures, stealthily creeping into position as a guard of dishonour. Then the occupants hear the rattle of accoutrements as an armed party marches into the porch. Hannibal has no need to be told the meaning; since a

Roman envoy arrived at the court of Prusias he has been anticipating some such action. His attendants hurriedly rush to see if there is an avenue of escape, if one of the secret passages which have been prepared is open. Everywhere, however, they are brought to a halt by the glint of arms. The spies of the king have done their work well, his band of assassins are watching every bolt-hole.

But there is one resource they cannot block. Hannibal calls for poison, long kept ready, and with the comment, majestic in its irony, but perhaps apocryphal, 'Let us release the Romans from their long anxiety, since they think it too long to wait for the death of an old man,' he drains the cup. Thus, defying his life-long foes to the end, passes the one man who might have diverted the Roman flood which was soon to submerge the whole Mediterranean world; the man who almost changed the whole course of history.



COIN OF HANNIBAL'S LAST BETRAYER

This silver tetradrachm preserves with remarkable clearness and obvious verisimilitude the lineaments of Prusias I, king of Bithynia in 228-185 B.C. To his hospitality Hannibal, when finally defeated, confided himself, only to be betrayed at last. The minions of the Roman envoy were at hand, the house of Hannibal was surrounded, and poison was the only escape.

*From Ward, 'Greek Coins'*

strength of Carthage for a fresh military cast? We shall never know. For now the hatred and distrust of Hannibal felt by Rome become apparent. In vain Scipio protests that such vindictiveness to a man is unbecoming to the dignity of the Roman people. Cato, with his parrot-cry of 'Delenda est Carthago,' carries the first step of his programme of persecution, and to avoid being brought to trial, Hannibal flees from Carthage by sea. Nine years of boyhood filled with visions, seven of middle age filled with disillusion, were all that Hannibal saw of his native land.

Henceforward he sets out again on the stony path of revenge. He has failed to raise the West against Rome; for the remainder of his life he will try to raise the East—to rouse the lands whence came his forefathers before they too felt the iron heel of Rome. From Tyre, the cradle of the Phoenician race, he goes to the court of Antiochus, King of Syria, who is contemplating an invasion of Greece to stem the Roman tide. Once more Hannibal

*Last hours of the great captain*

# THE AGONY OF GREECE: HOW THE LEAGUES AROSE

New Political Expedients devised by the Greek  
Genius in the last Days of Independence

By EDWYN BEVAN

Lecturer on Hellenistic History and Literature, King's College, London; Author of  
Hellenism and Christianity, etc.

How from the primitive tribal society two forms of state arose in the ancient world earlier chapters in this work have shown (see Chapters 14, 34 and 36). The first was the monarchic state which took shape in the countries of the Nile and of the Euphrates before the time when written records of mankind began. Under the rule of a monarch a much larger number of men could be organized for particular tasks than was possible under primitive tribal conditions: there was a much larger agglomeration and concentration of human power. But this greater power was gained by the sacrifice of the old tribal freedom.

Then, with the emergence of Greek civilization—one may say roughly in the seventh century B.C.—a new type of state appeared, the city state. In the city state there was an agglomeration of men for common tasks greater than in the primitive tribe, though not so great as in the monarchic state; on the other hand, there was not the same sacrifice of liberty. When the Greek city state reached its full development in the fifth century B.C.—especially in Athens—it was definitely republican. The community was ruled by the general will expressed in popular assemblies, and although practically all Greek states at one time or another, even Athens, fell under the despotic rule of a single man—a 'tyrannos'—there was a strong Greek sentiment which condemned such a condition of things as evil. To overthrow a 'tyrant' and restore popular freedom was regarded as a heroic action.

It was in this new form of state—the city state—that Greek rationalist culture

was developed, with all its wonderful intellectual, literary and artistic productions. But from the first moment that the city state existed it had to compete with the other form of state in the countries adjacent to Greek lands—with Lydia and Persia, and afterwards with Macedonia. And it was immediately obvious at what a disadvantage the city state stood from its limitation in size. It might represent a more highly organized form of human society; its citizen-soldiers, man for man, might be better fighters than any which Persia could put into the field; but against the mass of human material under the command of a king whose realm stretched from the Mediterranean to the Indus the few thousands which composed the army of a Greek city state must ultimately give way.

It was the tragedy of the Greek city state that after a few generations of brilliance it did succumb to monarchic power. By a momentary combination, indeed, the European Greeks were able to repel the Persian attempt to subdue them in their own home land at the beginning of the fifth century B.C.; but they were never able to inflict serious damage upon the Persian Empire in Asia, and ultimately the European Greeks had to see the Greek cities of the Asiatic seaboard fall back under Persian rule. And then the European Greeks succumbed to the Macedonian monarchy.

In antiquity there was no way in which the people inhabiting a large area could be politically united except by the rule of a monarch. It might be considered that

the growth of Republican Rome refutes such an assertion, but even here the large area of the empire was despotically ruled, only the despot was the oligarchy of the Italian city. And the Roman republican forms did break down under the necessities of empire: Rome itself had to become a monarchy, and the Senate had to give place to an emperor. It is only in modern times, with means of communication unknown to the ancient world, that it has become possible for a state to be both large and free.

The tragedy of the Greek city state came from its being too small. Yet attempts were made by Greeks to form larger aggregates of power

**Attempts at Confederation** by co-operation between a number of different urban communities. In the fifth century B.C. the way chosen to secure this co-operation was alliance. The Delian Confederation, headed by Athens, was formed to carry on the war against Persia, and counterbalancing this was the group of mainland city states allied with Sparta. But the Delian Confederation changed from an alliance between a group of equal states to an empire in which Athens ruled over subject peoples, and the states in alliance with Sparta were in fact subordinate to Sparta (see Chap. 45). This way of combining the forces of a number of city states offended Greek sentiment: freedom was understood to mean that no city state should be under the rule of any outside power, whether a monarch or another city (the principle expressed in the phrase the 'autonomy of the Hellenes'), and this in practice would mean the political isolation of each city state, and its consequent weakness in the face of large aggregates of power.

In the interval between the death of Alexander and the coming of Rome another form of association was tried in Greece, in a forlorn attempt to remedy the disadvantage of the single city state before it was too late—the way of federation. It is this new movement of Greek political instinct which gives its special interest to the last days of Greek freedom. Not that federal communities were an entirely new thing in the Greek world, or that the two 'Leagues'—the Aetolian

and the Achaean—which played the principal part in these days, had not existed at the earlier time; only these two old Leagues now come from the background into the foreground; they are developed and extended, and show capacities which under more favourable conditions might have kept Greece free.

That part of the Greek people which had drawn together centuries before into great cities—Athens, Corinth, Miletus, Ephesus, Syracuse, and so on—had developed the peculiar culture of the Greek city state. But they had not been the whole of the Greek people. In certain areas of Greece the people still continued to live scattered in small towns in the primitive way, with no large urban centre, backward in culture as compared with the great Greek cities, playing little part as communities in the movements of the time, though their young men might often be found in the mercenary armies formed of adventurers from all parts of the Greek world.

These more primitive communities, organized rather as rural or mountain tribes than as citizens, had the form of federations. This was the case with the Aetolians, Acarnanians, Phocians and Locrians, and the Achaeans of the Peloponnesus. One of the Greek peoples which played a great part in the fifth and fourth centuries—the Boeotian—was organized as a federation, but the fact that one city, Thebes, was vastly greater and stronger than any of the others prevented the federal system from working smoothly.

The Aetolians inhabited a mountainous region, which the civilization of the great Greek cities had only

imperfectly penetrated. **Organization of the Aetolian League** They were counted good fighters, but had also a bad reputation as treebooters. With their neighbours on the west, the Acarnanians, they had a hereditary enmity. It is immediately after the death of Alexander that the Aetolian League begins to show itself as a power in Greece, and in 279, when the Gallic horde penetrated as far as Delphi, the Aetolians took a principal part in the defence.

The Aetolian 'League' ('koinon') was a state in which the inhabitants of the small townships dotted over the hills all

had equal rights as 'Aetolians.' At its head was an annual president or general with the military title, 'strategos.' Sovereignty in the state rested with the assembly of the people which met at the sacred precinct of Thermum in the heart of the country once a year, in autumn, but might also be called together at other times for special purposes, at any convenient place. It belonged to the assembly to decide the most important issues, including the declaration of war, the conclusion of peace, the making of treaties. In time of war an Aetolian army in the field might act as an assembly.

Any Aetolian had a right to take part in the assembly, though it was naturally only the men of greater means and leisure who could make the journey from places at a distance, so that the assembly would not stand in much danger of mob rule. Probably in the Aetolian League voting was not simply by heads present, but each township, according to its importance, was assigned a certain proportion of votes, so that the disparity between places far away from the place of assembly and places near would be corrected.

Besides the popular assembly there was a council ('synhedrion') consisting of about a thousand delegates from the



#### SYMBOL OF AETOLIAN POWER

Although cumbered by its constitution, the Aetolian League was by 265 B.C. among the strongest states in Greece and controlled the largest territory. A personification of Aetolia is depicted on this coin of the League.

From G. F. Hill, 'Select Greek Coins,' G. Van Oost, Paris

different townships, which no doubt met oftener and could determine questions of lesser importance, and a committee of 'apokletoi,' attached permanently to the strategos for the transaction of current business. As to the size of this committee, a statement quoted by Suidas from Polybius would seem to indicate that it very considerably exceeded thirty.

The strategos was the chief executive authority. He called out the state forces and dismissed them; he presided over the popular assembly, and conducted negotiations with other states. No one might be strategos two years running, though the same man might go on indefinitely being elected every other year. Immediately subordinate to the strategos was the Master of Horse ('hipparchos') and the Secretary of State ('demosios grammateus'). The strategos took chief command of the Aetolian forces in the field.

The chief weakness of the federal system as it is seen in the Aetolian League was in the cumbrousness with which its machinery worked in an emergency. When the popular assembly had determined on war, the League had no officials for mobilising the army. It depended on each several township to send its own contingent; if a war was unpopular with any



#### COINS OF THE ACHAEAN LEAGUE

A confederation of Peloponnesian states, the Achaean League had an organization similar to that of the Aetolian, but was much more coherent. Under the general Aratus it became a political power of prime importance in Greece.

British Museum





#### HOW GREECE WAS DIVIDED IN THE LAST DAYS OF ITS INDEPENDENCE

Greek politics after the days of Alexander were strangely different from those during the Peloponnesian War (see map in page 1391). Instead of a maritime 'confederacy' that was really an empire facing a territorial 'league' that was really a hegemony, we have two territorial groups, the Aetolian and Achaean, both genuinely federal. No attempt is made to show the complicated fluctuations of alliance, only the members proper of the leagues at their greatest extent are included.

set of townships, and they hung back, the federal army when it was marshalled might come lamentably short of what had been calculated. Again, there was no general system for raising revenue; proportionate contributions were laid upon the several townships, and these contributions were naturally kept as low as possible, so that the central government was perpetually short of funds, and the League could not afford to have a navy.

How much of this system had existed before Alexander, when the Aetolian state was confined to its native hills we cannot say. The momentous departure made in the days after Alexander was that the Aetolian League began now to incorporate non-Aetolian communities in neighbouring regions; the federal state began to show a power of expansion and absorption which had not belonged to the city state, and which seemed to hold out a hope that the Greeks might come to form free

states of larger area, more capable than the city state had been of standing up to the monarchies or to Rome.

During the wars between the Macedonian chiefs after Alexander's death the Aetolians drew in the hill-peoples to the north, beyond the Achelous—the region of Aperantia and the Agraei. About the same time they incorporated the Ozolian Locrians, and by 290 their power had stretched over Delphi. Soon after the Gallic invasion (279) the Aetolian League has come to include the Dolopes on the north, the Aenianes, the Oetasans and the Dorians of Doris, all the country down to Thermopylae, so that the Aetolian territory now reaches right across the waist of Greece from sea to sea. About 265 the Aetolians arranged a partition of Acarnania with Alexander, King of Epirus. The eastern districts were incorporated in the Aetolian League and the northern taken into alliance by Alexander. About

the same time the Aetolians incorporated the Epicnemidian Lócrians. The Aetolian territory was now larger than that of any other Greek state, except Macedonia.

Macedonia had not yet lost all its hold upon Greece. After the half-century of confusion which followed Alexander's death, Macedonia had been consolidated as a kingdom by Antigonos Gonatas, the grandson of Alexander's marshal, Antigonos the One-eyed. Macedonian garrisons still, in 267 B.C., held the Piræus, Chalcis in Euboea, and Corinth. Many of the city states of the Peloponnesus were governed by 'tyrants' in the Macedonian interest. But any elements in Greece hostile to the house of Antigonos were likely to get promises of support from the rival Macedonian house established in Egypt, the house of Ptolemy. In 266 the Chremonidean War broke out, the war in which Athens and Sparta were allied, with Ptolemaic backing, to break the Macedonian yoke. Aetolia seems to have stood aloof. When Antigonos in 265 marched with an army to attack Athens, he must have crossed Aetolian territory without opposition. The war of freedom was a failure. The Spartan king fell fighting against the Macedonian garrison in Corinth, and in 261 Athens surrendered.

Soon after this the moment came for the other federal state which played, together with the Aetolian, the principal part in Greece during these

Rise of the last days of Greek free-  
Achaean League dom to show itself a power  
—the Achaean League.

The rich city of Sicyon—a city with a Dorian ruling class—was, like many other city states of Greece, being governed in 252 by a 'tyrant' in the Macedonian interest. In May, 251, a band of Sicyonians who, as enemies of the tyrant, had been living in exile, broke into the city by night and proclaimed a restoration of the republican constitution. The tyrant fled and Sicyon was free. The leader of this band was a young man called Aratus. The next step which Aratus took was momentous: he induced Sicyon to join the Achaean League.

The Achaeans, who inhabited the country along the northern sea-board of the Peloponnesus, represented the older

population of the Peloponnesus before the Dorian invasion. They had lived all these centuries past an uneventful life in a number of small country towns. They were organized as a federal state whose constitution was in general similar to that of the Aetolians. The several towns were autonomous communities, so far as their internal affairs were concerned. At the head of the Achaean League, as of the Aetolian, was a president How the Achaean League functioned  
general with the title strategos. (Before 255 the annual presidency had been vested in two strategoi.) Sovereignty resided in the mass meeting ('synkletos') held once a year at Aegium, which any citizen over thirty years old of an Achaean city might attend; though voting here, too, was by cities, not by heads. For affairs of lesser importance there was, as in Aetolia, a council of delegates ('synodos') which met at least twice a year at Aegium, and a committee of ten members attached permanently to the strategos, corresponding to the Aetolian apokletoi; in Achaea they were called 'damiorgoi.' Here, again, besides the strategos we find a Master of the Horse and a Secretary, and here, too, the rule prevailed that no one might be strategos for two successive years.

By the accession of such a city as Sicyon the Achaean League acquired an importance it had never had before. About the same time the republican movement went through Arcadia. Aristodamos, the tyrant of Megalopolis, who seems to have been an excellent ruler, as autocrats go, was assassinated, and Megalopolis became the centre for a federation of Arcadian cities, in close understanding with the Achaean state.

The hundred years which followed the accession of Sicyon to the Achaean League were the last hundred years in which independent Greek states carried on war and diplomacy. The intricate vicissitudes of that story cannot be told here, only its main outlines noted. In Greece we have four main powers, whose changing relations make up the story—two monarchic powers and two republican. One monarchic power was the kingdom of Macedonia. We must

consider Macedonia now as a genuinely Greek power; its court and upper class were just as Greek in language and culture as the states of Greece proper. The other monarchic power was the old Greek state of Sparta. Sparta had for centuries been more than a simple city state, since a considerable area of the

**Two Monarchic  
Greek Powers**

Peloponnesus with numerous country towns had formed the Lacedaemonian state under the rule of the Spartan aristocracy. By tradition at the head of the Spartan state were two joint kings, belonging to two different royal houses, though, since the main power had been in the hands of the ephors, Sparta could hardly in the past have been called a monarchy. But in our period we see forcible individuals establish a genuine despotism in Sparta—at first one or other of the two legitimate kings, and after that adventurers belonging to the Spartan aristocracy.



The two republican powers were the Aetolian League and the Achaean League. Besides these four there are a number of minor states—the Boeotians, the Eleans, the Messenians, the Acarnanians—attached now to one, now to another of the four main powers, according to the turns and changes of the situation. None of these four powers was a city state, like the states, other than Sparta, which had played the great parts in the days before Alexander. The Greek states which now make history are states with a considerable territorial area—monarchies or 'Leagues.' Athens still existed, the leading city of the Greek world in culture, with her philosophical schools and her magnificent works of art, but Athens had no military power after 261, and down to its siege by Sulla in 87 B.C. counted for little in international politics.

The story of these hundred years is a story of almost continuous wars. Over and over again we hear of regions deliberately destroyed by invading armies, of cities taken and spoiled and the inhabitants sold into slavery. The amount of destruction inflicted by Greeks upon Greeks during the period is appalling. For if these wars were the last wars of free Greek states, they were only in very

small measures wars for Greek freedom. They were wars between the Greek states themselves. Nor was the strife only between state and state. Each state was largely divided against itself: each contained a faction which, when worsted, looked for support to an enemy state against the dominant faction at home. If the defeated faction was driven into exile and their lands appropriated by the victors, the making of peace was complicated by the fact that the return of the exiles meant a fresh internal convulsion consequent upon the redistribution of their old property.

The quarrels between the Greek states gave, of course, various opportunities of interference to the surrounding powers. At the beginning of the period the chief interfering power was the house of Ptolemy. But the king of Egypt only exceptionally landed forces in Greece; he was strong by his riches, and his interference mainly consisted in financial help given to one or other of the contending Greek powers. Another outside power that interfered, as our period goes on, was the state of Pergamum in Asia Minor. Its kings belonged to a Greek dynasty descended from a certain Attalus which established itself there in the days of confusion after Alexander the Great, and were all called either Attalus or Eumenes (see Chronicles VI and VII); Pergamum (illustrated in pages 1690-1692) was a power Asiatic in its territory but quite Hellenic in character. At one time king Antiochus 'the Great,' of the Macedonian dynasty of Seleucus that was reigning in Syria and Mesopotamia invaded Greece (see page 1689), and tried to establish his hegemony there.

As time went on, the great republican power of the West, Rome, thrust in and interfered more and more, till at last Greek freedom came to an end. Then there was no king of Macedonia or king of Sparta or Aetolian League or Achaean League any more; all Macedonia and Greece became subject to Rome. But for many of the Greeks, it must be remembered, subjection to Rome was not a change from freedom to subjection, but a change from one subjection to another—



Solidly constructed of stone on a simple plan (left), this dwelling is typical of many raised in Priene during the Hellenistic period. It is of medium size and, as the above reconstruction shows, had no upper storey. The rooms, which were small (the largest was about 24 by 23 feet), opened on a spacious inner courtyard that gave access to the street.



Much light has been shed on domestic architecture of Hellenistic times by excavations at Priene, a city of ancient culture but little contemporary importance in Asia Minor. Private houses were disposed in blocks, but each was a unit in itself. The example reconstructed in this page had few rooms, which lacked windows, being lighted from the courtyard or by lamps. The actual remains of the dining-room are seen above, with the pillars that stood at its entrance.

#### HOW MEN DWELT IN THE CITIES OF HELLENISTIC DAYS

From T. Wiegand and H. Schröder, 'Priene'

subjection to Rome instead of subjection to Macedonia, or Aetolia or Sparta. We find, indeed, that the Romans often camouflage their conquest of Greece as a 'liberation of the Hellenes.' In fighting against Rome, the king of Macedonia or the Aetolian League were fighting just as much for their power to rule over other Greeks as for independence from Rome.

Of the four chief powers of Greece in 250 B.C. Macedonia had the largest area, military resources and wealth. Since the

days of Alexander the Great the ambition of the kings of Macedonia had not been to destroy the old free states of Greece, but to retain a predominant influence over the whole country, and if this hegemony of Macedonia was a galling limitation of Greek liberty, the kings of Macedonia might, at any rate, urge that they were always doing a service to the Greek peoples which deserved repayment. Macedonia was the bulwark which protected Greece against the barbarian peoples of the north. Over and over again all through this period the half-civilized Balkan tribes, especially the Dardanians, broke into Macedonia and half the strength and energy of the king had to be diverted from fighting his antagonists in Greece to the defence of his northern frontier.

If therefore Macedonia was the strongest power, it was always fighting with this handicap. The nearest region of Greece, Thessaly, was definitely annexed to the Macedonian kingdom; the Thessalian cavalry was a valuable element in the Macedonian armies. Besides this, the Macedonian king's military hold on Greece was mainly conditioned by his possession of the three key-fortresses, Demetrias in the land of the Magnesians, Chalcis in Euboea, and the citadel of Corinth. All these places were occupied in 250 by Macedonian garrisons.

The Sicyonian Aratus, who in 251 had brought his native city into the Achaean League, soon rose to the position of greatest influence in the League. In 245-4 he was elected strategos. For the next thirty years (till his death in 214-13) he was the most notable politician in the Greek world, supple and sagacious, adroit

in adjusting his policy to the changes of the situation, and sincere at any rate in his devotion to the Achaean cause. Unfortunately the office of strategos combined military with political duties, and Aratus was a poor general. He had the kind of courage which could successfully carry out the seizure of a city by night, but in a battle his nerve was apt to fail. In 243 he achieved a brilliant stroke by a surprise attack on the Macedonian garrison in the citadel of Corinth (Acrocorinthus). Corinth was wrested from Macedonia and attached to the Achaeans. Within a year Megara, Epidaurus, Troezen also became Achaean.

In the grouping of the powers at this moment Sparta, under the young king Agis, was allied with the Achaeans; and the Aetolians with Macedonia. Between the Aetolian freebooting mountaineers and the steady-going countrymen of Achaea there was almost permanent bitter antagonism. In 241-240 Aetolian bands invaded the Peloponnesus and swept, plundering, through Arcadia and Laconia. Soon after the accession of Demetrius II to the Macedonian throne (239 B.C.) there

was a new grouping of the powers. In Epirus the old dynasty was overthrown and Epirus organized as a federal state. The Aetolian began to seize places which had belonged to Epirus, and this brought them into conflict with Macedonia. The Achaeans are now allies of the Aetolians against Macedonia. In 235 the Achaean League received a new important accession. Lydiadas the tyrant of Megalopolis, abdicated and brought his city into the League. Like Aratus, he became himself at once a leading man in the League and was strategos in 234-3.

Amongst the allies of Macedonia were the Illyrians, whose piratical craft infested the Adriatic. Their piracy roused Rome to action. In 229 a Roman expedition first crossed the Adriatic—a momentous event—and gave the Illyrians a severe lesson. As a result, Corcyra (Corfu), the Greek towns of the Illyrian coast and some of the tribes of the interior came to be embraced in the Roman system of alliances. As the suppressors of piracy, the Romans

appeared to the Greeks at this time in the light of benefactors; Roman ambassadors were given friendly reception by the Aetolians and Achaeans, and the Corinthians resolved that the Romans should be admitted, like Greeks, to the Isthmian games. But there on the Adriatic coast, at the edge of Greece, the strong Latin republic had fixed its talons and would never let go.

King Demetrius II fell in 230-229 defending his northern frontier against the Dardanians. He left an infant son, Philip; the regency was assumed by his cousin, Antigonos, nicknamed Doson, who ruled with the title of king. Antigonos restored some degree of cohesion to the disordered kingdom; but Macedonian influence in Greece had declined. The commander of the Macedonian garrison which held Athens gave back to the Athenians their independence. Aegina joined the Achaean League and Aratus now succeeded in inducing the tyrant of Argos to lay down

his power and bring in Argos. (229). Events in Sparta, however, gave Antigonos his opportunity.

Wealth and land had come at Sparta to be concentrated in a few hands and the remainder of the community was full of unrest. Projects for social reform had first been put forward in 243 by king Agis, but the opposite party succeeded in frustrating the project and having Agis put to death. Then the project was resumed by the young king of the other royal house, Cleomenes III, who came to the throne in 235. Cleomenes' plans for internal reform went with the ambition to make himself the chief power in the Peloponnesus, and in 229 he began conquering the cities of Arcadia and attacked Megalopolis. This brought on war between Sparta and the Achaean League—on the one side the young king, warlike, romantic, vehement, on the other side Aratus, the cunning, unmilitary politician. In 226 Cleomenes inflicted a severe defeat upon the Achaeans



#### DECADENT CLEVERNESS TYPICAL OF HELLENISTIC SCULPTORS

Like literature, art suffered a decline during the Hellenistic period. Although sculptors, for example, possessed brilliant technical ability, imagination gave place to fancy. The two studies shown here are characteristic; both are admirably executed; in both emotional rather than aesthetic qualities predominate. That on the left was copied from a bronze (now lost) by Boethus of Chalcidion (fl. c. 200 B.C.); the cretinous street-boy removing a thorn from his foot came from Priene.

*Left, Munich Glyptothek; right, from Wiegand and Schroeder, 'Priene'*



The work of Hellenistic sculptors had often purity of form but seldom genuine beauty. This bronze head from Pergamum (left) has something in common with the best works of Greek sculpture, but is pretty rather than beautiful. The vase in the shape of a woman's head is elegant, but has little artistic merit.

*Berlin, British and Delphi Museums; right, photo, Alinari*



#### SPECIMENS OF THE ART PRODUCED IN THE HELLENISTIC AGE

Slavish accuracy and ingenious composition redeem to some extent the preciousness of Hellenistic sculpture. In the peasant woman (centre) the intricacies of the drapery are more carefully modelled than the figure; but the old shepherdess, from Alexandria, has genuine feeling. Although the portrait bust (top right) is marred by weakness and decadent technique, the statue of a deified Hellenistic ruler (bottom right) imitates not ignobly the work of earlier masters.

*Conservators, Rome, Metropolitan Museum, New York, and Museo delle Terme, Rome; photos, Mansell and Anderson*

near Dyme. King Ptolemy who had been financing Aratus began to back Cleomenes. And now came a surprising move by Aratus. He, the great enemy of Macedonia, reversed Achaean policy and made an alliance with Antigonus. As the price of it, Aratus had to agree to give back the newly won citadel of Corinth to Macedonia.

In 224 Antigonus led a Macedonian army into the Peloponnesus, and war went on between the Spartans on the one side and the combined Macedonians and Achaeans on the other (the 'Cleomenic War'). In the third year of the war (222) Sparta was decisively defeated in the battle of Sellasia, and Cleomenes took refuge in Egypt. The following year Antigonus Doson died in Macedonia, from overstrain in a fight against a new incursion of Balkan tribes. Had he lived, the course of history might have been different, for while he was concerned to assert the hegemony of Macedonia in Greece, he treated the Greeks with consideration and tact, and he might have succeeded in getting them willingly to accept his leadership.

The young Philip now took up the reins of government (221), and a year later Macedonia was involved in a war with the Aetolians. The Aetolians had thrown forces

**Macedonian policy under Philip V** into Messene, and the Achaeans called upon Philip for help. Almost all the free Greek states were joined with Macedonia in this war against the Aetolians, which is therefore known as the 'War of the Allies.' In the Peloponnesus the Achaeans fared badly against the Aetolian forces, but both in 219 and in 218 Philip invaded Aetolia itself, and in the second invasion destroyed the precinct of Thermum, where the popular assembly of the Aetolian League met. In 217 peace was brought about by the mediation of Rhodes.

At the Congress of Naupactus, where peace was settled, the Aetolian Agelaos made a notable speech. He pointed to the great struggle then going on in the west between Rome and Carthage—the 'clouds in the West'—and he warned the Greeks that if they went on fighting amongst themselves they would all in the end become subjects of the victor in that struggle. All who heard the speech



AMBITIOUS RULER OF MACEDON

Philip V consistently endeavoured to restore Macedon to the predominant position that she had formerly held. An able politician and soldier, he was successful against Greek opponents, but was decisively beaten by Rome in 197 B.C.

From G. F. Hill, 'Selected Greek Coins,' G. Van Oost, Paris

agreed, just as people agree now when the probable consequences are pointed out of further conflicts like the Great War between the European Powers. But to see the danger was not enough in order to avoid it, because to avoid it meant that each state must sacrifice some of its own ambitions, and that the Greek states would not do. So the fighting went on and the words of Agelaos came true.

In the next war (212-205) the Romans took part, as allies of the Aetolians against Philip. Hence we call this war, from the Roman point of view, the 'First Macedonian War.' With the Romans and Aetolians were also the Eleans and the Spartans, and Attalus I of Pergamum, whose naval force played a principal part in the coast warfare; with Philip were the Achaeans. The Romans at this time had too much on their hands in Italy to act effectually in Greece, and after 208 seem to have taken little part. Hence the Aetolians were hard pressed by the Macedonians, and in 206, to the displeasure of Rome, they made a separate peace. In the following year peace was concluded between Macedonia and Rome—the 'Peace of Phoenice' (205), from a town on the coast of Epirus where Philip met the representatives of Rome. The peace maintained the status quo in Greece,



as far as the territories and possessions of the several powers went, without important change. It only left a strong feeling against Philip in the Greek world. He had shown himself a man of remarkable energy, with a ready biting wit, but brutal, vindictive, and unrestrained in his lusts.

In the Peloponnesus war between the Achaeans and Spartans was continued in the years following the Peace of Phoenice. The chief man of the Achaean League was now Philopoemen, an Arcadian of Megalopolis. In 208 he had for the first time been elected strategos of the League. If Aratus had been an able statesman but a poor soldier, Philopoemen was an excellent soldier, but not much of a statesman. He was the adventurous, happy warrior of the Garibaldi type. Under his leadership the Achaean forces were reorganized and became a much more effective power. Philopoemen is sometimes spoken of as the last champion of Greek freedom, and he was indeed one of the last Greeks who aspired to treat with Roman commanders on a footing of equality; but it must be remembered that the enemy whom Philopoemen was most of the time engaged in fighting was the neighbouring Greek state of Sparta.

Sparta, too, at this time was led by a forcible personality, Nabis, commonly spoken of as a 'tyrant,' because, although descended apparently from one of the royal houses, he had no hereditary claim to the throne. He had founded his power largely on taking the part of the poorer Spartans against the rich, but he used his power savagely. He was a bitter hater of the Achaeans, and ruthless in his warfare.

In 202 and 201 Philip's activity was turned in a new direction. An infant, Ptolemy V, had just succeeded to the throne of Egypt; Philip and the Seleucid king, Antiochus III, in concert, fell upon the Ptolemaic possessions in Asia Minor. Philip conquered part of Caria which had been subject to Ptolemy, and thereby came into conflict with Rhodes. In no Greek state did the spirit of Greek freedom live more strong than in this maritime island-republic. A quarrel also broke out between Philip and Athens. Soon the Ptolemaic court, Rhodes, Athens and the king of Pergamum were all appealing to Rome. Rome thought that the time had come when she must deal drastically with Macedonia.

The 'Second Macedonian War' began in 200 B.C. At the beginning of it Philip



ONCE THE HARBOUR OF A PROSPEROUS RHODIAN CITY

Rhodes, an island state that had early become an important commercial centre, was, immediately after the death of Alexander the Great, the predominant maritime power in the Aegean. The aggressive policy of Philip V of Macedon, however, brought him into collision with Rhodes, whose government appealed to Rome, thus precipitating the Second Macedonian War. The bay shown above, guarded by the bluff on which stood the citadel, was the north harbour of Lindus, a Rhodian city.

showed the kind of man he was by destroying with the barbarity of a vandal the land of Attica, rich in beautiful things. This time the Achaeans prudently evaded Philip's request to fight with him against Rome. The Aetolians, who were not on good terms with Rome since their separate peace, were not at first disposed to join the Romans against Philip, but after the first Roman successes, made alliance with Rome, as before. One of the chief disadvantages of Macedonia was that it possessed no navy to meet the Roman, Pergamene and Rhodian ships at sea.

In 198 the consul who took command of the Roman army in Greece was Titus Quinctius Flamininus, one of the prominent figures of the age—an ardent phil-Hellene, upon whom the literature, art and traditions of the Greeks had thrown their spell. He hungered for the adulation which the Greeks were soon ready enough to bestow. Soon after the advent of 'Titus'—as the Greeks usually called him without addition—the Achaeans determined to come in on the side of Rome. The Spartans and Boeotians followed suit. In the end all the Greeks stood with Rome against Macedonia, except the Thessalians, who were practically part of the Macedonian kingdom, and the Acarnanians, who had always seen in Macedonia their champion against the Aetolians. The decisive battle was fought in 197 at Cynoscephalae ('Dog's Heads') in Thessaly—a crushing defeat for Philip which left him no choice but to accept the Roman terms.

After this, although the Aetolians clamoured to go on with the war till the reigning house of Macedonia was utterly overthrown, Titus made peace. All the Greeks were to be 'free,' which meant that no Greek city was to be held by a Macedonian garrison. When Titus at the Isthmian games of 196 proclaimed the freedom of those Greek states which had been subject to Macedonia, the multitude present were beside themselves with emotion. (See Wordsworth's sonnet *On a Celebrated Event in Ancient History*, beginning, 'A Roman Master stands on Grecian ground.') But the Aetolians were inclined to sneer; it was

cant for the Romans to talk about the freedom of Greece so long as they retained the three key-fortresses, Demetrias, Chalcis and Acrocorinthus. Yet, after the Congress of Corinth (spring, 194), Titus—such was his zeal for Greek freedom—withdrawn the Roman garrisons from the three fortresses. Titus at the Congress exhorted the Greeks to use their newly gained freedom to keep peace amongst themselves. The assembled Greeks sobbed. Titus himself wept. It was an orgy of generous sentiment. The Romans really evacuated Greece, though they had carefully seen to it that in the freed states the party of the rich, everywhere the friends of Rome, were in power.

The Greeks were soon fighting each other again. In the Peloponnesus war went on between the Achaeans, led by Philopoemen, and the Spartans under Nabis. The Aetolians were left embittered against Rome, with an inordinate estimate of their own share in the recent victory. They began to look east to the Seleucid power, which had had a surprising revival under Antiochus III, and were soon calling upon the Greek 'Great King' to intervene in Greece. Surely the lord of Asia, with his multitudes and his elephants and fabulous riches, would be more than a match even for Rome. Meantime the Aetolians attempted three great strokes simultaneously on their own account—to get possession of Demetrias, of Sparta and of Chalcis. They succeeded only in getting Demetrias. Though, in their sudden raid on Sparta, they killed King Nabis, their force was exterminated by the furious Spartans; Philopoemen intervened and Sparta joined the Achaean League. To win Chalcis the Aetolians failed.

In 192 Antiochus landed in Greece, but with a force disappointingly small. His allies in Greece were the Aetolians, and the Peloponnesian allies of the Aetolians; the Messenians, that is, and the Eleans. The Greeks generally preferred to wait events. The slaughter of a small Roman contingent at Delium by the Seleucid commander made a *casus belli* between Antiochus and Rome. Before the Romans could strike effectively, Antiochus achieved

Outbreak of  
new quarrels

'Titus' proclaims  
Greek freedom



#### LAST MACEDONIAN KING

The successor of Philip V was his bastard son Perseus, who obtained the throne by intrigue. Forced into war with Rome, he showed ability, but was defeated (168) and taken captive, when Macedon was carved into four republics.

*From J. Ward, 'Greek Coins' (John Murray)*

some successes. He possessed himself of Chalcis, he won over the Boeotians and got a number of towns in Thessaly. But the great armies expected from Asia never arrived, and the Aetolians, whose man power had been severely drawn upon by the former fighting in Greece and by the mercenary service which great numbers of Aetolians had entered under king Ptolemy, proved capable of little.

Philip, whatever resentment he may have felt against Rome, was yet more incensed against the king of the rival Macedonian house, who was attempting to supplant him in Greece, and he did his part as an ally of Rome. When in 191 the consul, Acilius, had entered Thessaly with a Roman army, Antiochus and the Aetolians could offer but a sorry resistance. The Seleucid king tried to make a stand in the pass of Thermopylae, but a Roman detachment under Marcus Cato turned the position, and the phalanx of Antiochus was cut down. The king himself escaped, and with those portions of his forces that he could still gather together went back to Asia. Thither, into his own dominions, a Roman army followed him, and next year shattered the Graeco-Asiatic army of Antiochus near Magnesia-on-Sipylus in Asia Minor (190 B.C.). The Seleucid had to renounce all his dominions north of the Taurus, which the Romans made over to the king of Pergamum (see page 1693).

In Greece the Aetolians remained to be chastised, and war went on between Rome and the Aetolians till 189. Then the Romans granted a peace unexpectedly lenient. The Aetolians had to pay a war indemnity and give up all the places the

Romans had conquered in Greece or which had voluntarily joined the Romans since the armistice of 190. They had to conclude a fresh alliance with Rome which pledged them to put their forces at Rome's disposal in any future war in Greece, and they had to send many of their chief men as hostages to Rome. But within narrower frontiers the Aetolian state was allowed to go on existing in relative independence. Its formidable power was gone for ever. The leniency of the Romans to the Aetolians was due to their consciousness that a fresh storm was brewing in Macedonia. In the last war Philip had conquered from the Aetolians Demetrias and various places in Macedonia. He had used his alliance with Rome to win back something of what he had lost after Cynoscephalae, and began to think of renewing the contest with Rome when he should have made better preparations than on the former occasion.

In 186-5 the question became acute between Philip and Rome; a dispute arose as to which of the conquests that he had made in the last war as an ally of Rome Philip was to give back. Meantime he proceeded with his military preparations. The Macedonian crown prince, Philip's son Demetrius, stood for friendship with Rome, and the relations between father and son became strained. Philip had another son by a concubine, Perseus, who intrigued against his legitimate half-brother and supported his father's anti-Roman projects. In 179 Philip was induced to believe falsely that Demetrius was conspiring against him and had him assassinated. Perseus was now sure of



#### ROMAN POWER IN GREECE

Immediately after conquering Macedon, Rome established obedient republics; but in 148 B.C. the country was made a Roman province. Above, two provincial tetradrachms—that on the right bearing insignia of the Roman quaestor.

*From J. Ward, 'Greek Coins'*

the inheritance, but Philip discovered the fraud and Perseus fled to Thrace. Before, however, Philip could complete arrangements for making a cousin the heir, he died at the comparatively early age of 58 (179 B.C.), and Perseus succeeded.

One result of the last war had been that the whole of the Peloponnesus had become Achaean. It fell to Philopoemen, the leading man of the League, to reorganize the state in its new extension. The meeting of the synodos, it was ordained, would in future be held at other Peloponnesian cities beside Aegium, as might be convenient each year. Sparta was still full of unrest, and in 188 Philopoemen intervened with a strong hand. After some bloodshed it was arranged that the old constitution of Lycurgus should be abolished and Sparta adopt the Achaean laws. The Spartans appealed to Rome, and Roman commissioners appeared in the Peloponnesus to adjust the quarrels between the

various Spartan parties and the Achaeans according to the mind of Rome. Friction resulted between Rome and the Achaeans: Philopoemen's bearing was indeed more independent than the Romans could brook. At Roman instigation, Messene revolted from the League. Philopoemen, who was now old and ill, entered the city with a force too small to coerce the Messenians; he was captured and compelled by them to drink hemlock (183 B.C.). The Achaeans aroused themselves to vengeance and Messene was reconquered. In Sparta there were fresh outbreaks of trouble and fresh appeals to Rome.

In the Achaean state two parties now came to be sharply marked off, the party which desired to maintain an independent attitude with regard to Rome, headed by Lycortas, the father of the historian Polybius, and the party which advocated complete subservience to Rome, headed by Callicrates. In 179 Callicrates was sent as ambassador to Rome on the Spartan question. He secured a compromise by which the laws of Lycurgus were restored, but Sparta remained in a loose connexion with the League.

Perseus of Macedon inherited from his father a reorganized army and a replen-



**BUILT WHEN ROME RULED ATHENS**

Dating from the early first century B.C. the Tower of the Winds at Athens illustrates the continued prosperity of the city under Roman dominance. A building of distinguished beauty, it served as a meteorological bureau, hence its popular name.

*Photo, Alinari.*

ished treasury. But he shrank from a conflict with Rome and tried to keep the peace. The Romans, however, had now made up their minds that, whatever Perseus did, an end must be put to the Macedonian kingdom. In 171 they declared war; nothing but an unconditional surrender would satisfy them. Perseus saw no choice but to fight, and he was able to put in the field a larger Macedonian army than any which had appeared since Alexander.

In all the states of Greece the democratic party prayed for Perseus's victory, since they saw that otherwise all the Greeks would become the helpless subjects of Rome. Yet no Greek state dared to join in the last fight of Macedonia. The most which Rhodes thought it might do was to offer mediation in the course of the struggle—an offer which brought down upon the Rhodians severe chastisement when the struggle was over. The war—the 'Third Macedonian War'—was decided in 168 by the battle of Pydna, in which the consul Aemilius Paullus

inflicted upon Perseus an irreparable defeat. Macedonia was not yet made a Roman province but was divided into four separate republics. Perseus was carried a prisoner to Italy, where he died.

The hand of Rome fell heavily upon the Greek states in which sympathy with Perseus had been shown. Rhodes was punished till it grovelled; the Aetolians had to give up everything outside their own mountain country; even the Achaeans had to send 1,000 of their principal men as hostages to Rome (amongst them Polybius). Rome did not yet undertake to govern Greece directly. It only secured that the ruling men in each state should belong to the rich class, and be men absolutely subservient to the will of Rome. Political life in the Greek cities became utterly demoralised; unprincipled egoists, with the support of Rome, rose everywhere to power, and used their power for making away with rival politicians.

In Macedonia the settlement made after Pydna did not long endure. Pretenders arose who claimed to be of royal blood and caused fresh trouble.

**Rome swallows Macedonia** In 148, the Romans made the whole of Macedonia, once more united, a province under a Roman governor. It is strange that even at this date a wave of popular passion could cause a number of Greek states to engage on a mad, hopeless fight with the new masters of the world. It began in 149 with the old trouble between the Achaeans and Spartans. The Spartans tried to get Rome to interfere in their favour, and the Achaeans were resolved to settle the Spartan business themselves, without reference to Rome. The democratic party, led by Diaeus and Critolaus, won the ascendancy in the League. At last Critolaus told Rome's envoys to their face, when they came in the spring of 146 B.C. to the assembly of the League at Corinth, that the Achaeans wanted to have the Romans for friends, not for masters.

War followed, and the Achaeans were joined by the Boeotians, Locrians and Euboeans; the Aetolians stood aloof.

Rome crushed the Greeks easily. An army of Achaeans and allies was annihilated by Metellus in central Greece. Before 146 was out, the consul, Lucius Mummius, had taken Corinth, and the Achaean League lay prostrate. Corinth the Romans utterly destroyed; its whole population was sold into slavery, and its works of art defaced or taken to Rome. For a century the site of the great and ancient city was a field of ruins. Corinth was then recolonised by Julius Caesar with a wholly new population. It was to these later Corinthians that S. Paul wrote his epistles To the Corinthians.

After 146 Greece was definitely a subject country. It was not till later that it was constituted the Roman province of 'Achaëa'; at first it was annexed to Macedonia, **Greece finally under the proconsular subject to Rome** governor of that province.

The different Greek peoples had their separate treaties with Rome, which compelled them for the most part to pay tribute. Sparta was given exceptionally favourable terms. The Achaean League was reduced once more to the old Achaean country. Other federations—the Aetolian, Phocian, Locrian, Elean, Messenian—continued to exist and manage their own internal affairs. But they were no longer free to fight each other.

Rome had come into a land whose peoples, left to themselves, were perpetually engaged in mutual war and destruction, somewhat as the British came into India. At first the Roman Peace, even if it meant foreign rule, seemed a relief. The material well-being of the land may have gained for a time. But the domination of the richer class, now secure in all Greek states, led to increasing impoverishment of the rest of the community and the population of Greece declined. Then Roman merchants, capitalists, speculators came to settle on a country which their privileged position enabled them to exploit, and the Greeks forgot the evils which had marred their freedom, and saw the past, transfigured in memory, only as a great age which would never return.

# Third Era

## THE WORLD STATE

201 B.C.—A.D. 476

### Chronicle VIII—THE NEW AGE OF ROMAN CONQUEST, 201-133 B.C.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 58. The Spirit of Republican Rome<br><i>Joseph Wells</i>          | 60. The Religion of the Latins<br><i>Cyril Bailey</i>                 |
| 59. The War-craft of the Romans<br><i>T. Rice Holmes, D.Litt.</i> | 61. Greek Culture Comes to Rome<br><i>Prof. R. S. Conway, Litt.D.</i> |

### Chronicle IX—ROME'S EXPANSION AND HER RIVAL GENERALS, 133-31 B.C.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 62. Fabric of the Roman State<br><i>Prof. H. Stuart-Jones</i> | 63. Social Life under the Republic<br><i>Prof. F. H. Marshall</i> |
| 64. From the Gracchi to Augustus<br><i>Prof. F. A. Wright</i> |   |

### Chronicle X—THE SHAPING OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, 31 B.C.—A.D. 98

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 65. The New Imperial Idea<br><i>Joseph Wells</i>                             | 67. Paganism & the Philosophies<br><i>The Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D.</i> |
| 66. Latin and its Literature<br><i>Prof. J. Wight Duff, D.Litt.</i>          | 68. The Flourishing of Art and Architecture<br><i>H. B. Walters</i>      |
| 69. The Fall of Jerusalem and its Significance<br><i>Prof. W. A. Elmslie</i> |  |

### Chronicle XI—THE EMPIRE IN ITS GRANDEUR, A.D. 98-211

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 70. A Roman Citizen Surveys the World<br><i>Hugh Last</i>             | 73. Later Greek Science<br><i>Charles Singer</i>           |
| 71. A Day in the Life of Imperial Rome<br><i>Prof. F. H. Marshall</i> | 74. The Rival Religions<br><i>The Very Rev. W. R. Inge</i> |
| 72. Rome the Builder<br><i>Prof. R. C. Bosanquet, F.S.A.</i>          | 75. China's Expansion<br><i>Lionel Giles, D.Litt.</i>      |

### Chronicle XII—THE EMPIRE IN DECLINE, A.D. 217-330

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 76. Trade and Commerce of the Roman World<br><i>G. H. Stevenson</i>    | 78. Rome the World's Law Giver<br><i>Prof. F. de Zulueta, D.C.L.</i> |
| 77. Britain as a Roman Province<br><i>Sir George Macdonald, K.C.B.</i> | 79. Alexandrine Literature and Learning<br><i>Edwyn Bevan</i>        |
| 80. The Triumph of Christianity<br><i>The Very Rev. W. R. Inge</i>     |  |

### Chronicle XIII—THE SUNDERING EMPIRE, A.D. 330-476

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 81. The Germanic Invaders<br><i>W. O. L. Copeland</i>         | 82. Decay of the Western Power<br><i>Norman Baynes</i> |
| 83. What the Modern World Owes to Rome<br><i>Cyril Bailey</i> |  |

**W**HAT we saw Alexander the Great attempting in Chronicle VI it fell to the lot of Rome to achieve. Alexander, it is true, penetrated farther to the eastward than Roman sway ever extended, but the underlying ambition of his campaigns (which would undoubtedly have included the West had his life been spared) was by stilling its internecine quarrels to liberate Hellenism for the task of civilizing the world. His death cut short his schemes; but Rome, after absorbing Greek culture, and by

## Note on the World State

her own native genius for organization, created the 'World State' in microcosm through which Hellenism was transmitted to posterity. In this Era we trace the fortunes and the social significance of that Empire, through the two distracted centuries of its formation under the Republic, the two centuries of its splendour under the

first Caesars, and its more than two centuries of slow decline down to the deposition of the last emperor—a period of some six hundred years that no other empire has exceeded (since only at intervals has China been an empire, properly so called), and that had a continuation at Byzantium for a further thousand years.

## TABLE OF DATES FOR CHRONICLE VIII

*Unless otherwise stated in italics, dates refer to events in the Graeco-Roman world*

<b>B.C.</b>			
801	Rome annexes Spanish dominion of Carthage. Numidia an independent ally under Masinissa.	178	Attempted assassination of Eumenes of Pergamum attributed to Perseus of Macedon.
	Philip of Macedon, in association with Antiochus of Syria, invades Ionia; checked by Attalus of Pergamum, he retires.	171	Third Macedonian War begins.
800	Philip attacks Attica. As champion of Greek independence, Rome declares (Second Macedonian) War. Athens relieved by Roman fleet.	170	Antiochus takes Pelusium and retires.
	Indicative campaigning.		China: Wen Ti emperor till 157; period of revival of learning and humanitarian legislation.
199	Rhiny of Boli and Insures in Calsipne Gaul.	169	Philometor shares the crown of Egypt with his brother Ptolemy Phiscon. Second invasion by Antiochus.
198	Flaminianus in Thessaly. Achaean League joins the Roman alliance.	168	Intervention of Roman envoys in Egypt; the 'circle of Popillius'; Antiochus retires and sacks Jerusalem. Revolt of the Hasmonaeans (Maccabees) led by Matthias.
	Antiochus recovers Coele-Syria from Egypt.		Macedonian war: Perseus crushed at Pydna by Aemilius Paullus.
187	Decisive Roman victory at Cynoscephalae. Gauls defeated in Italy.	167	End of Macedonian monarchy. Macedon divided into four dependent republics.
	Rome organizes the four provincial governments, Sicily, Sardinia, and the two Spain.		Aemilius Paullus deals mercifully with Epikrus. A thousand Achaean hostages, Polybius being one, are taken to Italy.
186	Peace terms granted to Insures (Trans-Po); the Boli remain in arms.	166	Massalia appeals to Rome for aid against Gauls.
	Peace terms with Philip as a dependent ally.		Syria: Judas Maccabaeus, son of Matthias, leads the Jewish insurgents.
	Flaminianus proclaims the Freedom of Greece at the Isthmian Games.	165	Judas Maccabaeus takes and holds Jerusalem.
185	Hannibal, exiled from Carthage, joins Antiochus, hoping to turn a great coalition against Rome.	164	Death of Antiochus Epiphanes; the Syrian monarchy in dissolution.
	M. Porcius Cato in Spain.		Ptolemy Philometor, appealing to Rome, is reinstated as sole king.
	Birth of Terentius Afer (Terence). Plautus fl.	161	Roman treaty with Judas Maccabaeus.
198	Ptolemy V marries Cleopatra, d. of Antiochus.		Death of Judas. He is succeeded by his brother Jonathan.
198	Antiochus III crosses to Greece. Beginning of Syrian War. Philip sides with Rome. Roman fleet, in conjunction with Rhodes, Pergamum, etc., commands the Aegean.	160	India: Menander reigns at Kabul till c.140.
191	Antiochus routed at Thermopylae; he retreats to Asia Minor.	159	Ligurians, raiding Gaul, defeated by Optinus.
	Final subjugation of the Boli in Italy.	158	Revolts of Celtiberians and Lusitanians in Spain, owing to misrule of Roman governors.
190	L. Scipio (Asiaticus), in command against Antiochus; whose fleet is shattered at Myonessus, and his army at Magnesia.	161	Lucullus in Spain breaks faith with the Spaniards. Treacherous massacre of Lusitanians by Galba. Remnant of Achaean hostages repatriated; they stir up hostility to Rome.
	Manlius Vulso, of his own authority, conducts a victorious campaign in Galatia, for which he is awarded a triumph.	160	War declared against Carthage (Third Punic War). Death of Masinissa, and partition of Numidia.
189	Antiochus is deprived of Asia Minor and of his fleet, and Armenia is made an independent kingdom. Roman colony planted at Bononia (Bologna).		Revolt of Andriacus (Pseudo-Philippus) in Macedon.
	Final subjugation of the Aetolians.		Fourth Macedonian War.
188	Northern extension of Flaminian and Aemilian Ways.	160	Andriacus crushed by Metellus Macedonicus. Macedon made a Roman Province.
187	Death of Antiochus III. Seleucus IV king.	167	Achaean League attacks Sparta. Rome intervenes.
185	Ligurian highlanders in N. Italy maintain war for twenty years.	166	Scipio (Africanus Minor) sent to command in Africa. Siege and fall of Carthage, which is obliterated, and its site solemnly cursed.
	Scipio Africanus retires from public life.		Roman Province of Africa constituted.
	India: Bekhathra, the last Maurya, killed by Pushyamitra who founds the Sunga dynasty of Magadha. Brahman reaction against Buddhism.	160	Corinth taken and sacked by Mummius.
184	Roman colony of Aquileia, at the head of the Adriatic. Censorship of M. Porcius Cato 'the Censor'.		Greece constituted Roman Province of Achaia.
	Death of Scipio Africanus.	160	Ptolemy VII Phiscon succeeds Philometor.
183	Death of Hannibal in Bithynia.		Virithius heads Lusitanian insurgents (S. Spain); Numantian revolts in the north.
	Death of Philopoemen.	160	Hasmonaeans dynasty in Judaea established, under Simon, last of the brothers.
181	Romans in Spain. Great defeat of the Celtiberians by Fulvius Flaccus.	161	Senate ratifies peace with Virithius.
	Accession of Ptolemy VI Philometor. His mother Cleopatra regent till 173.	160	Virithius assassinated. War renewed.
180	Ligurians almost crushed by Aemilius Paullus.	159	Asia: Yueh-chi (Scythians) on the Oxus.
	Asia: Demetrius of Bactria 'king of the Indians'.		China: Alision of Chang Chien to Yueh-chi.
179	Pacification of Spain by policy of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus (father of the Gracchi).	158	Lusitanians subdued by Decimus Brutus.
178	Macedon; death of Philip V and accession of Perseus.	157	Numantians compel Mancinus and Roman army to capitulate; terms negotiated by Tib. Gracchus repudiated by Senate. War continues.
176	Gracchus in Sardinia.	156	Decimus Brutus in Gallicia.
	Accession of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.	155	Outbreak of great slave revolt in Sicily.
	India: Repulse of a Greek conqueror (Menander?) by Pushyamitra of Magadha.	154	Numantian war; Scipio sent to command.
175	Death of Cleopatra; quarrel of the government with Antiochus IV over rights in Coele-Syria.	153	Surrender of Numantia, which is obliterated.
			Death of Attalus III of Pergamum, who bequeaths his kingdom to the Roman People. First territorial possession of Rome in Asia.
			Tiberius Gracchus elected Tribune of the Plebs.

# THE NEW AGE OF ROMAN CONQUEST: 201—133 B.C.

**T**HE Persian Achaemenids at the opening of the fifth century B.C. had come very near to the creation of a world state. Had the outcome of the three great battles of 480 and 479, Salamis, Plataea and Himera, been reversed, the greater part of Hellas would have been absorbed into the Persian empire immediately, and the rest of it into a Carthaginian empire which, presumably, would presently have followed the same course. Whether that world state would have broken up is an interesting study in the might-have-beens; but the Hellenes prevented it decisively from ever coming into being. When a century and a half had elapsed, Alexander had come very near to the creation of a world state centring in Macedon instead of Persia; but his death decisively prevented its actual realization. When another hundred years had passed, no one could have dreamed of a universal empire for any one of the five Great Powers—Macedon, Syria, Egypt, Carthage and Rome—which among them dominated the whole civilized world (except the Indian and Chinese empires, which might be called a separate world or worlds).

### Changed Aspect of the Ancient World

**T**WENTY years later all was changed; for Hannibal had failed in his Titanic effort, directed not so much to the creation of a vast, all-embracing Carthaginian empire, which would have been impossible, as to the destruction of Rome. He had only succeeded in ruining Carthage and welding Rome into a supremely powerful state for which world empire was no impracticable dream. For centuries to come, the history of the world is the story of the expansion of the Italian power into the world state, whose bounds were the bounds of the known civilized world, beyond which lay not states but tribes still migrant and unsettled.

When Zama had been lost and won, and Carthage had accepted the terms dictated by the victorious Scipio, Rome was without even a potential rival to her power on land or sea west of the Adriatic. Her supremacy over all Italy south of the Po was consolidated; she was undisputed mistress of Sicily; Carthage was disarmed, and all her dependencies in Africa or in Spain were dependencies of Rome; the only native potentate in Africa who could bring a strong force into the field, Masinissa of Numidia, was a friend and ally whose dominion she had herself helped to extend. The Cisalpine Gauls of North Italy, the Transalpine Gauls of what is now France, the semi-Gallic Celtiberian tribes of Spain, owed her no allegiance; but none of them had passed beyond the stage of tribal confederation to the institution of a definite polity. Their gradual subjection to the organized power was merely a question of time—though actually of a longer time than might reasonably have been anticipated at the conclusion of the second Punic War.

### Division of Power in the East

**T**URNING to the East: three Great Powers were masters of what had been for a brief moment the empire of Alexander—Macedon in its European part, and Syria (the Seleucids) in Asia, the third power being Egypt under the Macedonian dynasty of the Ptolemies, still dominant in Coele-Syria and parts of the Asiatic coast. Rome had already been brought into hostile contact with the first, and friendly contact with the third; for the Ptolemies looked to her as a counterpoise to the Antigonids and Seleucids. Not only had Ptolemy IV Philopator renewed with Rome in 210 the treaty of amity made by his grandfather in 273, but on his death in 205 the guardianship of his five-year-old son and heir, Ptolemy V Epiphanes, had been offered by the regency



to the Roman Senate, and accepted; while Philip V of Macedon and Antiochus III of Syria were coming to a private agreement for the sharing of the infant's dominions between Macedon and Syria. Virtually, though not technically, Egypt had already become a Roman protectorate.


Carthage was no longer a power in east or west; she might with perfect safety be neglected. Any notable recrudescence of her fighting power would merely provide Rome with an excuse for blotting her out altogether, as eventually happened clearly enough. She herself, not Rome, drove Hannibal into exile, and there was not even a return from Elba for her Napoleon. Though while he lived his personal

influence was exerted to stir up enemies against Rome and his unequalled military genius was at their service if they had had the wit to make use of it, Carthage repudiated her mighty son, and concentrated upon commercial revival—though as we shall presently see she did not thereby escape her doom.

Sixty years after the battle of Zama Carthage had been levelled with the ground; the kingdom of Egypt was nominally the ally, actually the dependency, of Rome; Macedon and Greece were Roman provinces administered by Roman governors; and the Seleucids had been cleared out of Asia Minor for good and all. For every step Rome could persuade

herself that more than sufficient justification had been provided by the victims, but the victims were not of the same opinion.

Two years had not elapsed since the battle of Zama when war was for the second time declared between Rome and Macedon. The peace of 205 had never been more than an armed truce; though the war preceding it had never assumed large proportions, since on the part of Rome it had been simply a diversion to prevent Philip from giving Hannibal active support in Italy. Just as Philip had been seduced into seeking an aggressive alliance with Hannibal by the crushing victory of the Carthaginians at Lake Trasimene in 217, the Roman victory on the Metaurus in 207 had soon convinced him that nothing was to be gained by continuing active hostilities, though he sent a contingent to the help of the Carthaginians in their last hopeless struggle. But no Roman government, however pacifically



#### STONE THAT IMMORTALISES A PTOLEMY

Set up at Memphis to commemorate the coronation of Ptolemy V Epiphanes, the Rosetta stone is inscribed with a decree in Greek and Egyptian. It was from this bilingual record, which is set down in three scripts—Greek, hieroglyphic and demotic—that modern archaeologists learnt to read the Egyptian hieroglyphs.

British Museum

## New Age Of Roman Conquest

disposed, could have shut its eyes to the fact of his hostility to Rome; and a government not pacifically disposed was quite certain to make the most of any activities on the part of Philip which could bear a suspicious interpretation. If Philip did not intend to invite war, he certainly provided ample excuse for such suspicions. For the policy to which he committed himself was palpably aggressive, and was directed against friends and allies of Rome if not immediately against Rome herself.

Philip's purpose of consolidating and extending his despotic rule over the nominally free cities of Greece, the Aegean and the coasts of Asia Minor, was scarcely disguised. In 201 he carried troops across the Hellespont and set about the conquest of Caria, where after some successes he was shut up for a time by the united efforts of the Rhodian fleet and Attalus, king of Pergamum. Thence he escaped, to find Athens and other Greek cities breaking away (200) and appealing to Rome, to whose remonstrances he replied in defiant terms. The Roman people had had its fill of fighting, and refused to declare war until bluntly warned by the Senate that the real choice before them was not between war and peace but between war in Macedon or in Italy. In the character of liberator, Rome declared war.

### Decisive Roman Interference in Greece

It was tolerably clear that the Greeks could not throw off the yoke of Macedon without the help of Rome, and that if they did not throw it off it would weigh them down with a merciless oppression. Whether in ridding themselves of the Macedonian bear they would merely be falling into the maw of the Roman wolf was a question not so easily answered. Those who were in the most immediate danger from Philip made their choice without hesitation; others were doubtful; others were fast in the grip of Philip's creatures. But the political confusion in Greece during this period has already been described in Chapter 57.

The campaigning in 200 and 199 was ineffective. In 198 the command of the Roman and allied army was taken by Titus Quinctius Flaminius; and no one

save the great Scipio was so well qualified for the task. He succeeded in winning over the Achaean League, which had been reluctant to join hands with the rival Aetolian League, the allies of Rome



### WARD OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC


Rome became the guardian of Ptolemy V (left) on the death of his father (205 B.C.). Its attitude towards Egypt is suggested in the denarius (right) showing a Roman tutor, Lepidus, crowning Ptolemy—probably a fictitious event.

*From J. Ward, 'Greek Coins,' and G. F. Hill, 'Historical Roman Coins.'*

from the beginning. Negotiations with the king proved fruitless, since the demands of the Roman on behalf of the allies would have practically deprived Philip of all control in Greece. But in 197 Flaminius was able to bring Philip to a decisive engagement at Cynoscephalae in Thessaly, where the Macedonian phalanx was thrown into disorder in attempting an advance over broken ground, the Roman seized the momentary advantage, and Philip's army was annihilated.

After Cynoscephalae Flaminius could dictate his own terms—to his Greek allies no less securely than to the vanquished foe, whom he chose to treat with a generosity by no means to the liking of more vindictive enemies. Philip was to remain king of Macedon and to pay a heavy indemnity, leaving his son Demetrius and other hostages in Rome; he was to withdraw his garrisons from the three towns which he himself named 'the Fetters of Greece'—Chalcis, Corinth and Demetrias in Boeotia. They passed into the occupation of Roman troops.

The full terms, however, were not immediately known; they could be laid down finally only by the Roman Senate, and all Greece waited anxiously to hear what measure of freedom would be granted; for it had known no real freedom since the days of Philip II. The celebration of the



SPHERE IN WHICH THE INFLUENCE OF ROME BECAME PREDOMINANT IN THE SECOND CENTURY B.C.

At the beginning of the short period of barely seventy years dealt with in this Chronicle Rome had become one of the great powers, and the Mediterranean ran with her defeat of Carthage; but the Greek and the Roman worlds were still separate, standing back to back on opposite sides of a line running down the Dalmatian coast and so to Africa. At the end of the period Rome was the only great Mediterranean power, and Hellenistic monarchs were bowing to the mere word of her envoys. It should be noticed that the map above covers both this and the following Chronicles.

common Hellenic festival of the Isthmian Games at Corinth in 196 was the scene and hour chosen; when the ringing voice of the herald proclaimed, to the amazed delight of the assembled multitude, the independence and freedom of all the Greek states that had been subject to Macedon.

But to proclaim freedom was one thing; to establish peace with freedom was another, owing to the jealousies and hatreds that divided city from city, state from state—causes of dissension already studied in Chapter 57. Two more years elapsed before Flamininus could leave Greece in the belief that his task was accomplished, withdrawing the Roman garrisons even from the Fetters of Greece. And even then the freedom he left behind him was an illusion.

### Schemes of Hannibal and Antiochus

THE Aetolians, the most bitter and the most ambitious of Philip's enemies, had been treated with scant regard by Flamininus and were now angrily hostile towards Rome, though powerless to act against her; they and others who shared their sentiments found a new ally in the ambitious king of Syria, who had hoped to make his own profit out of the Macedonian war by annexing the eastern territories over which either Philip or the child Ptolemy had claimed or held sway. After Cynoscephalae the Romans had sternly to warn him off an invasion of Thrace, following upon the seizure of cities in Asia which Philip had been forced to evacuate. Hannibal's attempt to reorganize Carthage after her humiliation had been frustrated, and the great captain, driven into exile but still relentlessly bent on the overthrow of Rome, made his way to Antiochus, at Ephesus, seeking to build up a new coalition against his lifelong foe. From the Aetolians came a mission with the same object, though there was no hope of support from Philip, who was no friend either of Antiochus or the Aetolians, and little enough from the Achaean League.

Antiochus viewed the scheme with favour; under Hannibal's direction, it would have been very formidable. His plan was that he should carry a powerful force to Carthage, bring Carthage herself

into the war, and invade Italy in force while the Greeks rose, supported by an overwhelming force from Asia. Even so, the success of it turned on Hannibal's old mistaken assumption that Rome's subjects and allies would spring to arms and hail with joy their liberators from the yoke of the tyrant state. But it was ruined from the outset by the blundering impetuosity of the Aetolians and the arrogant folly of Antiochus.

Encouraged by the favourable attitude of the king of Syria, the Aetolians and their ally Nabis, the unspeakable tyrant who had long been established in Sparta, where he was thoroughly hated, struck at once (192); but they only succeeded in capturing Demetrias (one of the three 'Fetters') and driving the Achaean League into active opposition under the still effective leadership of Philopoemen. With equal recklessness Antiochus threw overboard the large scheme of the Carthaginian, and, all unready as he was, flung himself into Greece with a wholly insufficient force, ignoring Hannibal altogether, and heedless of the fact that Athens and the Achaeans were unshaken in their loyalty to Rome.

### Asia feels the Hand of Rome

THIS end was not long in coming. Early in the next year (191) Roman armies, Philip co-operating, were entering Thessaly. To protect the south Antiochus occupied the historic pass of Thermopylae. As in the old days, the position, otherwise almost impregnable, was turned by a column which forced a way over the hills, and the defending army, taken in rear, broke and was cut to pieces; the hero of the day being Marcus Porcius Cato, type of the Roman equivalent of Puritanism. Antiochus escaped with a remnant only of his force to Chalcis, and thence to Asia.

Thither he was followed next year (190) by a Roman army under the command of Lucius Scipio, the less distinguished elder brother of Africanus; the Phoenician fleet having in the meantime been swept off the Aegean by the combined Roman and Rhodian squadrons, at the battle of Myonnesus. Near Magnesia, the huge but very miscellaneous host he had managed to collect was annihilated in a battle in which



The Altar of Zeus, built by Eumenes II, was the crowning glory of Pergamum. Here shown reconstructed, it stood on a huge base, surrounded on three sides by colonnades and approached on the fourth by a staircase. A frieze over 150 yards long, brilliantly executed and superb in effect, ran round the base.

*State Museum, Berlin*

the Roman losses were computed at four hundred, and those of Antiochus at 53,000. Again the monarch escaped with his life; but now he could only sue for peace on such terms as the victors might be pleased to grant. Those terms left him his kingdom of Syria, but in addition to the payment of a heavy indemnity he was required to surrender for ever his fleet, his elephants and all his possessions north and west of the Taurus mountains. Thus was the last power shattered which might, under other guidance, still have remained a possibly formidable rival to Rome. Hannibal escaped to Prusias, king of Bithynia, and not long afterwards (183) ended his own life, since Prusias was on the point of surrendering him to the Romans (page 1666).



#### BUILT WHEN PERGAMUM WAS AT THE ZENITH OF HER MAGNIFICENCE

As the friend and ally of Rome Pergamum gained vast accessions of territory in Asia Minor, and became one of the greatest centres of Hellenistic culture under Eumenes II, who reigned from 197 to 159 B.C. Very much wealthier than his predecessors, he was able to make Pergamum a city of majestic splendour, adorned with noble buildings and works of art. Above we see the Greek theatre, whose steepness and height make it the most impressive ruin of its kind.

*From 'Allartumer von Pergamon IV'*

## New Age Of Roman Conquest

The expulsion of Antiochus from Asia Minor was followed by an episode not without future significance. Lucius Scipio withdrew to Rome to receive a triumph and the hardly deserved title of Asiaticus, as his brother's great achievement had won for him that of Africanus. The eastern command devolved upon the new consul, Manlius Vulso, who, thirsting for military honours, discovered that the Galatians had fought in the armies of Antiochus—conduct obviously requiring punishment, the infliction of which incidentally offered promise of much booty accumulated by them in the course of half a century of brigandage. Accordingly Manlius declared war on his own responsibility, a



### WARRING GODDESSES AND GIANTS DEPICTED ON THE ALTAR OF ZEUS

Noble in conception and execution, the frieze on the Altar of Zeus at Pergamum represents the Battle of Gods and Giants—a subject emblematic of the city's struggles against the Gauls. In these sections typical in their animation, we see a goddess in the act of hurling a snake-wreathed jar (upper); and Victory crowning Athena who, assisted by an enormous serpent, drags a giant to the ground; his mother, the goddess Rhea, rises from the earth to plead for his life.

*State Museum, Berlin*



**ARCHITECTURAL GLORIES OF PERGAMUM IN THE HELLENISTIC AGE: THE ACROPOLIS AFTER IT WAS BEAUTIFIED BY EUMENES II**  
Described by the Romans as 'pre-eminent above all towns of Asia,' Pergamum in the reign of Eumenes II was the most beautiful of Hellenistic capitals. The principal buildings are here reconstructed. The Altar of Zeus is in the foreground; on the terrace behind it Attalus I had erected statues of his Gaulish foes (see page 187). Beyond are the formidable walls of the ancient fortress. The square above contains the ancient temple of Athena; near it is the library, whose collection of books was second only to that of Alexandria. On the summit of the acropolis is the magnificent temple of Aesculapius.

## New Age Of Roman Conquest

course of action for which there was no precedent, smote the Celts in a vigorous campaign, carried off plentiful spoils, and was rewarded with a triumph, despite the protests of those who condemned his action as flagrantly unconstitutional. The official sanction thus given to independent action on the part of a Roman general commanding Roman armies abroad was fraught with danger for the future.

Rome, as conqueror of the aggressive king of Syria, exercised the right of distributing the territories from which she had ejected him. She did not, however, as yet claim for herself any Asiatic soil; but the bulk of what Antiochus had held in Asia Minor was handed over to Eumenes of Pergamum, the successor of Attalus. He, like his father, had held fast by the Roman alliance and rendered good service in the recent war, as Attalus had done against Macedon. The result was the creation of a brilliant kingdom that figures little in contemporary narrative owing to its wise policy of friendship to Rome, but in all other respects now takes equal rank with the other 'successor states'. Pergamum itself rivalled Alexandria as a seat of learning and the arts.

Caria and Lycia, however, which had been stolen from Egypt, were transferred to the Rhodians as a reward for the services rendered by their fleet, instead of being restored to Ptolemy Epiphanes, that young king having been so injudicious as to marry a daughter of Antiochus.

### Settlement of Greek Affairs

MEANWHILE there had been no change in the ostensible policy of Rome in Greece. Flaminius had once more been called upon to conduct the settlement of affairs when Antiochus was flung back into Asia. The war had been forced upon Rome, and she could claim to have entered upon it as much in the interests of the Greeks who had invited her to intervene as in her own; but having intervened, she could not escape responsibility for the establishment of a just settlement among the jealous and vindictive states that had taken part in the war. It would have been strange indeed if she had allowed the finality of her decisions to be challenged.

What Philip as an ally had taken from the confederates in Thessaly he was permitted to retain; but just as after Cynoscephalae the Aetolians had not been allowed to wreak their vengeance on Philip, so now they were saved from the vengeance of their most vindictive foes. Like Philip they were given another chance. Cities which had hitherto held aloof from the Achaean League were compelled to join it, but the League itself was somewhat grimly warned that its sphere of action was confined to the Peloponnese, 'since a tortoise is safe just so long as it keeps its head within the shell.' There was no interference with autonomy, but the governments of the various states were palpably dependent on the good will of the Roman authority. Rome was in actual fact not less mistress of Greece than the great Philip had been master.

### Roman Policy in Gaul and Spain

FOR was it only in the East that she was preparing the way for imperial expansion during these years. During the decade after Zama the perpetually insurgent Gauls between the Alps and the Apennines were finally subjugated; though another decade passed before the Ligurian highlanders—a folk who until this time had not developed aggressive activities, but now began to issue in raiding swarms from their mountain fastnesses—were suppressed and scattered; and soon Roman roads and Roman military colonies were rendering the north of Italy as secure as any part of the peninsula. Before long the whole of what had been the Gallic and Ligurian area, independent of Roman authority, was transformed into the Roman province of Gallia Cisalpina, which, when once peace had been permanently established, became extremely flourishing.

In Farther Gaul, modern France, between Alps and Pyrenees, Rome had as yet no footing; but the Punic War had planted her in Spain with no rivals other than the native tribal communities. The Carthaginian dominion founded there south of the Ebro by Hannibal's father Hamilcar had passed into her possession, as well as her own former sphere of influence north of that river. She was



therefore mistress of its whole Mediterranean coast, with an undefined amount of the hinterland, but with the government of this territory still to be organized; the authority she enjoyed, however, was at the best dubious, the natives being warlike and by no means amenable to control, while in two-thirds of the peninsula it was non-existent.

Nevertheless, by 197 she had set up the first official machinery of a provincial government, dividing the dominion into a Nearer (the northern) and a Farther (the southern) Province; whereof the immediate result was a general rising of the tribesmen who had the customary objection to anything like an organized foreign domination. The subjugation of the insurgents was entrusted to Cato, consul in 195, who four years later distinguished himself, as we have already seen, at Thermopylae. After subjecting his troops to a severe training, in which he did not spare himself, he inflicted a great defeat on the insurgents, and by the severity of his measures and the rapidity of his movements soon brought the whole of the northern province into subjection for the time being; though the Spaniards, resentful of his tyrannical measures, were in arms again as soon as his back was turned. There followed years of constant fighting, which was only at last ended in 179 by the unwontedly conciliatory and sympathetic policy of the praetor, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, the chosen son-in-law of Scipio and, later, the father of two still more famous sons.

#### The Campaign against Perseus

FOR several years after the settlement of Asia Minor, Rome was involved in no foreign wars except the military operations against the Ligurians and in Spain. But the uneasiness of the dependent populations under her shadow grew. Philip plotted and schemed, but dared not show open hostility. In 179 he died, and was succeeded by his son Perseus, who was watched with jealous suspicion by Eumenes of Pergamum, always the faithful henchman of the power which had enlarged his kingdom. The policy of Perseus was directed to winning popu-

larity and support from Greek states, now more fearful of Roman than of Macedonian oppression, since many of them were suffering from tyrants or oligarchical governments that were the creatures of Rome. In 172 Eumenes laid before the Roman Senate charges against the king of Macedon. The verdict of the Senate was a foregone conclusion. When an attempt was made to murder Eumenes on his way home, it was assumed that Perseus was the instigator. In 171 Rome declared war.

Careful and unostentatious reorganization had made Macedon much better prepared for war than she had been at any time since Cynoscephalae. Rome met with no speedy success. In 171 and 170 her consular armies under Crassus and Mancinus were defeated. But in 168 the command was given to an old and tried chief, Aemilius Paullus, the brother-in-law of Africanus and father of the boy whom the son of Africanus adopted. He reorganized the forces and at Pydna won a victory as overwhelming as that of Cynoscephalae. A few weeks later the unhappy Perseus, deserted and betrayed by his followers, came into the camp of the victor and surrendered.

#### Final Crushing of Macedonia

As a power, Macedon was eliminated. The country was divided into four 'republics,' vassals of Rome, debarred from any political or commercial relations with each other, deprived of all leaders, and thus left to conduct their own administration as best they could under a code of laws formulated by the conqueror. Epirus, which had thrown in its lot with Perseus, was mercilessly punished; no fewer than seventy towns were required to deliver up all the gold and silver they contained, their walls were levelled with the ground and their inhabitants to the number of 150,000 were sold into slavery. Monstrous as such treatment sounds to modern ears, it did not in the least shock the civilized world two thousand years ago; Hannibal had offered almost identical terms to Saguntum when he summoned it to surrender; and the selling of conquered populations into slavery

## New Age Of Roman Conquest

was almost the normal sequel when cities were taken by storm. The more enlightened might deplore such methods, but they excited no denunciation.

### Ominous Change in Roman Temper

**I**N the twenty-nine years that passed between Cynoscephalae and Pydna the Roman attitude had been undergoing change. Flamininus honestly regarded himself and was regarded by the Roman people as a Liberator, assuming temporarily and with reluctance an authority which he desired to lay down at the earliest moment compatible with the general security. But the possession of power begets the lust of exercising and extending it, easily cloaked under pleas of necessity; even Flamininus was not the same after Thermopylae as after Cynoscephalae, and Paulus after Pydna was many degrees removed from Flamininus, though probably quite unconscious of the fact. There was less excuse for the abolition of the Macedonian monarchy in 168 than there would have been in 197, apart from the fact that Rome was now deliberately aiming at dominion. The new Macedonian republics were not independent or even dependent states; to all intents they were subject to Rome. And it must be added that Rome showed no sense of responsibility for the welfare of the new subjects brought under her sway, provided that they were held well in hand and were not too much impoverished to be economically useful.

The overthrow of Macedon was followed by another interval during which active expansion was suspended, though just before Pydna Rome had in very significant fashion asserted her effective power in another quarter. Antiochus IV Epiphanes was engaged in a war with Ptolemy VI Philometor of Egypt (page 1701). Rome regarded Egypt as being in some sort under her protection; and the envoy, Popilius Laenas, who had been sent there to warn Antiochus off, peremptorily ordered him to leave the country. When the king asked for time to consider, the envoy traced a circle round him, and then replied that his answer must be given before he crossed that line.

Antiochus bowed to the inevitable, and asserted no more claims in Egypt.

Rome, in plain terms, had, since the great days when she was fighting against Carthage with her back to the wall, degenerated into an irresistibly powerful bully. Governorships—confined to the scions of wealthy and powerful senatorial families—over remote provincials whom it was in no one's direct interest to protect from their rapacity, offered demoralising temptation too strong to be resisted, and sapped the moral sense of the governing class. The loot of the campaigns in Asia had begotten a new lust for wealth that might be had for the grasping, and for vicious luxuries unknown and unsought in the days when Rome was battling for existence rather than dominion. There was scarcely a pretence of consideration for justice in the Senate's high-handed treatment of nominal allies, or the exploitation by praetors of the subject peoples over whom they were sent to rule during a brief term of office.

### Men who stood for the Older Virtues

**T**HERE were men who preserved the old Roman virtue in its best sense—as the younger Scipio (185-129), the son of Aemilius Paullus; or in its most rigidly narrow sense—as Cato (234-149), who was in fact of the older generation. The doctrines of the Stoic philosophy (derived from contact with the Greeks) tended to preserve and even to elevate the old spirit where they found acceptance; but, on the other hand, the more popular forms of the rival Epicurean teaching fostered the new spirit of moral laxity generated by irresponsible power; and the degradation of the moral standards of life, whether public or private, is the most marked feature of the era of expansion. (The two great philosophies mentioned above are studied at length in Chapter 67.)

The new temper was manifested towards Greece as well as Macedon. The Achaean League had been very lukewarm latterly. Philopoemen, its greatest statesman, had been dead for some years. At the instance of the ambitious intriguer Callicrates, who had sold himself to the Romans, a thousand of the leading

Achaean were carried off to Rome in 167, nominally to stand trial on the charge of complicity with Perseus, actually to be detained as prisoners till the Romans chose to liberate the remnant still surviving in 151. The League itself was left in the hands of Callicrates, while in almost every city reigned a tyrant in the service of Rome.

#### Roman Misgovernment of Spain

**D**ESPITE the wise measures which had pacified Spain during the governorship of Gracchus, the Roman administration in that land of tribes intolerant of any limitation of their freedom was conducted after his departure on the lines of the new tyranny. Before long, the whole country was seething with hatred of its new masters, and praetors or consuls who could barely hold their own in the field against the hardy tribesmen did not hesitate to save their authority by acts of the grossest treachery which the degenerate Senate did not fail to endorse; though not without vigorous protest from old Cato and men of like mind, who were as honest as they were pitiless. The evil seed was to bear bitter enough fruit in due season.

But now the hour was at hand for the playing of the last act in the tragedy of Greece and the tragedy of Carthage.

In the years that followed the fall of Perseus, Macedon and Greece had sunk into a sad welter of misrule. Whether intentionally or not, the effect of the Roman methods was almost the disappearance of the very semblance of ordered government. In 149 there appeared in Macedon a claimant to the throne, calling himself Philip and pretending to be the grandson of Philip V. As a matter of course he found supporters, and as a matter of course he was suppressed as soon as Rome took the affair seriously.

But, before she did so, the pretender had been allowed to achieve some rather humiliating successes, which encouraged the latest intriguer who had captured an ascendancy in the now miserably disorganized Achaean League to take action against Sparta without referring the cause of quarrel to Rome, to whom Sparta, more cautious, appealed. While she was

finishing off the Pseudo-Philippus, as the Macedonian pretender was called, Rome dispatched commissioners to the League council assembled at Corinth, to signify her pleasure—and her displeasure. Sparta, Corinth and Argos were to be released from the League's jurisdiction.

The council lost its head and insulted the commissioners. Rome still gave them another chance of making submission to a second commission (147); but the leaders, too deeply committed to hope for pardon themselves, attempted to stir up a necessarily futile war of liberation (146). The Roman army from Macedon marched down to Corinth, dispersing resistance on its way. There the command was taken over by the new consul Mummius. The League commander Diaeus offered battle before the walls of Corinth, but his troops broke and fled at the first onset; and Mummius, learning that a garrison still occupied the Acropolis, entered the city and gave it to sack as if it had been carried by storm.

#### Last Act in the Tragedy of Greece

**T**HE men were massacred; the women and children were sold into slavery; the art treasures were seized for the state; save where the boorishness of the consul prevented him from recognizing their value—for Mummius achieved for himself a permanent niche in the temple of Stupidity by giving out that if any work of art were damaged the careless workmen would have to replace it with an equivalent; the loot was lavishly distributed; and when nothing removable was left, the beautiful city was given to the flames. It would be unfair to think of Mummius as a general type. The average Roman of the day conceived himself to be a man of superior culture and had a genuine if debased appreciation of things intellectual and artistic; but the callous brutality of the man was typical, and even in his stupidity he was by no means unique.

The fiction of independence was over. The precise year in which the formal changes were made is doubtful but Macedonia (probably) first, and then Greece under the name of Achaia, were very shortly after the destruction of

Corinth converted into provinces of the Roman dominion under Roman governors.

In the same year as that in which Corinth perished, Carthage was levelled with the ground, and what was left of her empire became the Province of Africa.

The smiting of Carthage was a measure prompted rather by a vindictive jealousy than by any real political necessity. While Hannibal was still in the city, there was always the possibility that his genius would again render her formidable; when he was an exile intriguing at the court of a still undefeated Antiochus, that possibility still survived. But when the eastern power had been swept out of existence at Magnesia, and Hannibal could find no safer asylum than with Prusias of Bithynia, and could only save himself from the Romans by taking his own life in 183, there was left no possibility that Carthage with or without allies would become once more a menace to the Roman state. But by a strict attention to business, the commerce of Carthage revived; humbled and crippled as she had been, she ventured to resist the encroachments of Masinissa, who was as ready at ninety to take the field in person as he had been at forty; the octogenarian Cato proclaimed in the Senate, in and out of season, that 'Carthage must be blotted out.' And blotted out she was.

### Revival of Carthaginian Trade

THE recuperation of Carthage after Zama had given amazing proof of her vitality. With Hannibal in exile, it may be assumed that his political opponents were in power, and the policy alternative to his was to gain Roman friendship if possible, and develop those resources, namely, the overland trade with the south and the carrying trade of Numidia, which in any case were beyond Roman reach, and little likely to compete with the produce or industries of Italy.

But Roman friendship was hard to gain. All Italy, as well as Rome itself, had suffered irreparably in the long war; agriculture in particular had been disorganized, and the fact that grain was one of the principal exports of Africa benefited only the cities, and spoiled the market for farm produce in Italy. The

continual drain on the Italian peasantry of Rome's eastern wars, which had begun against Philip of Macedon long before the Hannibalic War was over, led to the replacement of free labour by slaves, acquired easily in the course of those wars, or from the pirates whom it was impossible to check as long as no single power was supreme at sea and could assume responsibility. Most irremediable of all, Roman merchants had been obliged by war needs to trade on an even larger scale, and had acquired and created business connexions abroad, which they had no mind to neglect in peace time; and they had sufficient influence with their own government to put the worst construction on any complaint that came concerning the behaviour of Carthage.

### Friction between Carthage and Numidia

NOW such complaints could hardly fail to come where there was a ready ear for them. In particular, Masinissa had been established as head of an independent Numidian state, 'free and allied,' with no natural frontier between his country and the home district of Carthage, and with an ambiguous clause in the peace treaty granting him 'all that he or his ancestors had ever possessed,' which, strictly interpreted, gave him the ground on which Carthage itself was built. It was almost inevitable that there should be border troubles, and that the blame for these should be always on the city which was prohibited by treaty from 'making war in Africa' without the consent of Rome. Gradually the home district, on which Carthage depended for its food, passed into Numidian hands; only once, in the crisis of the last war with Macedon, was it thought prudent even to be considerate to Carthage; and with these territorial gains the moment came ever nearer when Masinissa's horsemen, deliberately unruly, would be within striking distance of the southward caravan routes, the only commercial monopoly which Carthage still held. Hence the persistent claims of Masinissa to the possession of the Libyan Tripolis, with its grassland moors, its rich coastplain, and its alternative routes to the south, from Leptis

Then came for the Romans local troubles in Spain, where Masinissa could, if he tried, be a very dangerous neighbour; and therewith fresh complaints of the wily old Numidian against Carthage. A Roman commission of inquiry and arbitration was sent to Africa in 150, with Marcus Cato at its head, old-fashioned, narrow-minded, unscrupulous; incapable of realizing that the world had changed in the last half-century; firmly convinced that the figs he saw in the market at Carthage proved the necessity for protecting Italian agriculturists by the elimination of their African competitor. On the point immediately at issue, the award was, of course, in favour of Masinissa; the result, further encroachment; and then, what Cato and his friends most desired, reprisals by Carthage and the inevitable Roman intervention. The old man, however, did not live to see the actual fulfilment of his craving.

'*Delenda est Carthago*'

THERE was, it is true, a 'popular party' in Carthage which had lost patience, and thought that Rome's momentary embarrassment with her Greek allies, and a futile revolt in Macedon, gave a desperate chance of resistance. Wiser heads probably realized that in Africa as in Macedon Roman foreign policy was shifting on to a new basis; that the day of 'free and equal allies' was over. Everything short of the worst was offered by the Carthaginian government in mitigation of sentence, and offered in vain. The Roman commanders had their orders; Carthage was to be destroyed, and its inhabitants interned where they pleased, so long as they were out of reach of the sea.

The effect of this order might have been foreseen. The desperate war party took control of the city; moderate men, who had tried to save what was not already lost, were massacred with the Italian residents, who were by this time numerous; levies were made among those towns and tribes of the neighbourhood who felt their own fate inseparable from that of Carthage, and preparations were made for a siege. The Romans made matters worse by allowing time for such measures;

then realized their mistake, and closed in on the city, suffering more severely from the marshes, where they made their camp, than from the enemy. It was not until after two years of mismanagement that the younger Scipio Aemilianus, who had already shown unusual ability, was elected, before his time, to be consul and commander-in-chief in Africa (147).

The northern suburbs of Carthage were soon occupied without difficulty, but the shorter lines of defence were stronger and easier to hold; and supplies still came by sea through the Roman blockade. It was only when Scipio had carried out the huge engineering works necessary to close the harbour entrance by a broad embankment, and also defeated the squadron which emerged through a newly dug channel beyond it, that the city was restricted to its own resources. Yet another winter passed before the moment came for an assault, on the merchants' quarter between the citadel and the port. It succeeded, and then from house to house the Romans cut their way up the slope for six days and nights, the ruined town being burnt and levelled behind them.

Fifty thousand Carthaginians surrendered before the end, and were spared; but the citadel, with the small remnant of heroes and deserters who held it, was burned. The whole site was devastated, solemnly cursed and ploughed over, and the smaller cities of Africa likewise. Only Utica, which had surrendered early, remained to be the capital of the new 'province of Africa.' Numidia remained 'free and allied'; but Masinissa was dead at last, and his three sons held separate baronies, and quarrelled with each other. The Libyan Tripolis, too, was kept separate from the African province, under direct Roman administration.

#### Mercantile Outlook of Roman State

IF the fate of Carthage had been completely detached from any policy or movement in contemporary history it would have been tragic enough, and attributable only to the profound animosity of leading Romans, and perhaps also of Italian peoples generally, against the city which had bred Hannibal and

## New Age Of Roman Conquest

shown such amazing tenacity of purpose in spite of Roman persecution. But it was more than this: it was an expression of the same new outlook, mercantile rather than statesmanlike, of responsible people in Rome, which wrecked and despoiled Corinth in the same year as it obliterated Carthage, and remained a constant danger in all dealings with Greek leagues and succession kingdoms. Senators, it had been long realized, could not be trusted to govern business communities fairly, if they themselves had business interests; on the other hand, business men had their own ways of influencing senatorial government, without sharing its responsibility. The shortcomings of the Roman provincial system in the next hundred years, as well as the worst disorder of Rome's republican decline, are mainly due to this conflict of principles, and it was only an accident—the fact that the domestic disorders came to a head before provincial grievances became intolerable—that made it possible for the Principate to be established without loss of Empire.

On the other hand, Carthage had failed to learn the lesson of the Sicilian and

Hannibalic Wars. To have ruled in Africa for centuries without acquiring the political experience which could conciliate the Sicilians or Sardinians, or even after a longer period the Spanish peoples which furnished such good citizens to Rome, and without admitting the population even of the home territory to share in the privileges or the responsibilities of government, was a lapse which would have been conspicuous even if there had been only the loosely knit empire of the Persians to contrast with it; compared with the Greek successor kingdoms, still more with the Roman dominion in Italy, it was a failure and a disgrace. And it was the partial adoption of Carthaginian methods of estate management, in the generation which followed the fall of Carthage, that led to the one serious mistake of the Romans, for which they paid so dearly in the next, through the revolt of their Italian 'allies.' The Greek city states had for the most part failed or succeeded politically according as they remained exclusive corporations, based on hereditary privilege or accumulated wealth, or accepted the 'desirable alien' and measured men's deserts by their abilities. Carthage, like



HEADQUARTERS OF A ROMAN LEGION BESIEGING A SPANISH CITY

Scipio Africanus the younger was appointed in 134 B.C. to the command of the Roman armies operating against the Celtiberians of northern Spain. Their resistance centred in the wealthy city of Numantia, which Scipio accordingly proceeded to reduce. Strong camps, well supplied with war engines, were built at strategical points, and Numantia blockaded into surrender. Here we see the remains of the tribunes' quarters in the first of these camps, situated at Peña Redonda.

*From Schullen, 'Numantia,' Bruckmann A.G.*



#### INGLORIOUS KINGS OF SYRIA

Succeeding to a kingdom diminished by war, Seleucus IV (top) reigned feebly, and was assassinated in 175. His successor, Antiochus IV, was an unbalanced ruler who drove the Jews to revolt; he died, mad, while warring in Persia.

*From J. Ward, 'Greek Coins' (John Murray)*

its Etruscan friends, remained 'exclusive'; it acquired unexampled monopolies; and reserving them jealously for its own enjoyment, perished apparently unregretted.

While Macedon and Carthage were receiving their coup de grâce, the Spaniards maintained their attitude of stubborn defiance, in spite of the cruel blows dealt them by the perfidy of the consuls Lucullus and Galba in 151 and 150. In the south the Lusitanians found a brilliant guerrilla captain in Viriathus, who in 142 manoeuvred the Roman consul Servilianus into a trap, and was able to dictate terms so reasonable in point of fact that they were ratified by the Senate, which even recognized Viriathus as 'friend and ally' of the Roman People. Nevertheless, two years later a new consul, Caepio, not only attacked the friend and ally, with the assent of the Senate, but procured his assassination, a blow from which the Lusitanians did not recover, though they were not further penalised.

No less stubborn was the resistance offered in the north by the Celtiberians, whose principal fortress or city was Numantia, on the borderland of what had been the vague Roman sphere of influence before the Hannibalic War. Here

the fighting, temporarily suppressed by Lucullus, broke out again in 143 when Viriathus' campaign was being carried through with most effect. One Roman general, Metellus, the same who had finished off the last Macedonian war but had been superseded in the east by Mummius, held the Spanish command for two years (143-2), and met with much success, but was withdrawn before he could complete the task of pacification. This labour continued to prove too much for one after another of his successors; until in 137 the consul Mancinus was reduced to what was, in fact, a capitulation, the terms of which were negotiated by his quaestor Tiberius Gracchus (c. 169-33); in whom the Spaniards did not hesitate to trust, since he was the son of that Tiberius Gracchus who had made the generous but ill-kept settlement of 179. The Senate, however, with strict legality but doubtful honour, declined to ratify the treaty; and the war was renewed, to the indignation of Gracchus.

Against a foe so indomitable, it was obviously useless to continue the ordinary routine method of appointment to the military command. Rome in 134 turned to her greatest citizen and soldier, the conqueror of Carthage, the second Scipio Africanus. Although he was not a candidate for the consulship and was in fact legally disqualified from standing, his election was carried by the unanimous vote of the Assembly of Tribes, and the legal technicalities were set aside in the face of such an expression of public opinion.

**E**VEN for Scipio the task was no easy one. It was not till he had restored by hard training the long-relaxed discipline of the demoralised troops that, in 133, he set about the Numantian campaign, and laid siege to Numantia itself. Like Carthage the doomed fortress held out grimly to the last moment. When there was nothing left to eat but human flesh, it surrendered; and it was then, like Carthage, obliterated; so completely that its very site was forgotten. The work of reorganizing the Spanish provinces was left for others.

In 134, the year of Scipio's unprecedented election to the consulship, his

colleague, Fulvius Flaccus, was called upon to deal with a terrifying insurrection of the widespread slave population in Sicily, the outcome of the huge development of the slave system in the constant wars of the last hundred, and more particularly the last seventy, years—wars which had flooded the market with slaves of every conceivable nationality. Of this first slave war and of others we shall hear more in Chronicle IX. The disastrous effect of the increase of slave labour on the agricultural population in Italy may be studied more fully in Chapter 58.


## Retrospect of Eastern Affairs

**U**NTIL THETO the affairs of the East since the time when Antiochus III, by his campaigns in Parthia, Bactria and Asia Minor, had acquired the title of 'the Great'—when Rome was still in the grip of the Second Punic War—have demanded attention only as they were directly related to the Roman expansion. We have seen Antiochus intervening in Europe and paying the penalty for his presumption by total expulsion from Asia Minor in 190; and we have seen his second son, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, obeying a peremptory order from Rome to remove himself from Egypt in 168. We have seen, also, that down to 133, Rome had not sought to annex any Asiatic territory, and had not even been involved in any military operations in Asia since the Galatian campaign of 189-8. But we have still to observe how during this period the course of events, without Roman intervention, was at the same time preparing the way for Rome's Asiatic expansion during the hundred years following, and setting bounds for it which it never effectively crossed.

The Seleucidæ were, in effect, the representatives of the old Persian Empire, with a Macedonian, instead of a Persian Achaemenid, on the throne of the Great King. At the moment when Antiochus III so rashly flung down his challenge to Rome, his title *Megas*, the Great, was not a palpable misnomer. He had recovered sovereignty, lost or endangered, westward in Asia Minor and eastward to Trans-Oxiana; and he had

forced Egypt to admit his sovereignty, often claimed as her own, in Coele-Syria; though in order to ensure at least her neutrality in the coming struggle, he had just married his daughter Cleopatra to the young Ptolemy V Epiphanes, giving certain revenues drawn from Coele-Syria as a part of her dowry. An incidental consequence of this has already been noticed. When Rome chastised the arrogance of the Great King, she handed over to Rhodes or Pergamum the districts in Asia Minor which Egypt had been wont to claim.

Antiochus III died soon afterwards, in 187. The troubled reign of his elder son, Seleucus IV, was ended by his murder in 175, when he was succeeded by his brother Antiochus IV Epiphanes, known by the glibbing nickname of Epimanes (the Madman). He quarrelled with the Egyptian government of Ptolemy VI Philometor (181-146), because it still claimed the Coele-Syrian revenues though the king's



## TO PAGANISE THE JEWS

In his endeavour to suppress the Jewish religion, Antiochus IV decreed that a pagan altar should be erected in every village throughout Judaea. This example, found at Gezer, is dedicated to Heracles, but bears also the name of Jehovah.

*From R. A. S. Macalister, 'Bible Sidights from Gezer'*



mother, Cleopatra, was dead. The conquest of Egypt seemed imminent, when the Roman envoy Popilius interposed his veto as recorded (page 1695).

**E**PIPHANES died, actually and completely mad, as it is said, in 164. The most familiar event in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes is the revolt of the Jews under the leadership of Judas Maccabaeus and his kinsmen, a revolt which ultimately won independence from their Syrian, or rather Macedonian, overlord. The Maccabean wars no doubt played their part in completing the disintegration of the Seleucid power; which, however, could have been saved, if at all, only by a ruler of first rate political and military genius. The fundamental importance of this struggle lies in the fact that if its issue had been different the Jews as a nation with a local habitation and a name would have been blotted out two centuries before this fate actually befell them. For the essential object of the wars was to secure that unique type of nationalism

which differentiated the Hebrews from all other peoples.

The Jews of the southern kingdom, deported by Nebuchadrezzar to Babylon in accordance with the policy so fully developed by the Assyrians, had been reinstated by the humane and liberal policy of the early Achaemenids. Unlike their northern kinsmen, they had adhered rigidly to the Mosaic Law; and the Persian system not only permitted but actually encouraged them to restore the old religious structure of their society. Alexander inherited and even extended the Persian policy of fostering local and national customs, which in this case made the Chosen Race a people apart from and in some sense hostile to the entire Gentile world. But among the Jews there was always an unorthodox element, attracted by pagan learning and pagan laxity.

Now Judaea and Jerusalem, the centre of Judaism, lay in that debatable land which had at all times been a bone of contention between the Euphratic and the Egyptian empires and continued to



**WALLS OF A CASTLE ONCE HELD BY POWERFUL JEWISH PRINCES**

In 142 B.C. Simon Maccabaeus succeeded his brother Jonathan as leader of the Jews, and shortly afterwards advanced against the Syrian garrison in Gezer (Gazara). Having captured the city, he established himself in it, as is related in the Apocrypha. Here we see the ruins of the castle, re-fortified and occupied by him, and later held by his son, John Hyrcanus. On the extreme left are the remains of the gateway, and in the foreground the foundations of the walls of Gezer.

*From R. A. S. Macalister, 'Bible Sidights from The Mound of Gezer'*

be a bone of contention between Seleucidæ and Ptolemies, while commonly finding itself compelled to acknowledge the Seleucid sovereignty. There was a large Jewish colony in Egypt which was patronised by the Ptolemies; consequently the intensely nationalist puritan party among the Jews tended to look to Egypt—to be, in fact, an Egyptian party. The unorthodox, on the other hand, sought and found favour and support from their actual overlord, the Hellenising Seleucid, against whom the nationalists were the more embittered by the heavy financial demands made on them for the indemnity claimed by Rome from Antiochus after his overthrow at Magnesia.

Religious persecution as such was quite alien to Hellenic ideas; but evidently Antiochus IV, when on the Egyptian expedition, the object of which was so rudely frustrated by Popilius, acquired the conviction that the Jewish puritans were a political danger. On his return in 168 he vented his wrath and disappointment on Jerusalem, which was ruthlessly sacked, and set about the suppression of the religion which appeared to be at once the motive and the binding force of Jewish disaffection. For the Jewish puritans, religious zeal and the fervour of patriotism were welded into one passion.

### The Maccabees in Palestine

**I**NSPIRED and led by the old Mattathias, of the Hasmonæan house, the puritans took to the hills and waged a fierce guerrilla warfare against the officers of the persecutor. Mattathias died and the struggle was carried on by his son Judas, surnamed Maccabæus, and his brethren. Antiochus died, and the Syrian crown was tossed from head to head among claimants, some of the blood royal and some mere adventurers. Judas recovered Jerusalem but was slain in battle in 161. He was followed by his brothers Jonathan and (in 142) Simon, and before the latter was murdered in 135, to be succeeded by his son John Hyrcanus, the Hasmonæan dynasty may be regarded as established. The dynasty, however, was of minor importance, the essential point was that Judaism had been saved (see Chap. 69).



### UNWORTHY SELEUCID MONARCHS

Under Demetrius I (top) and his successor, Demetrius II, the Syrian kingdom was weakened by internal war, and lost both territory and prestige. Both kings were vicious men whose cruelties roused their people to rebellion.

*From J. Ward, 'Greek Coins'*

When Antiochus Megas was expelled from Asia Minor, his sovereignty was still acknowledged not only by the satraps in Media and Persia, but by the native princes who had set up kingdoms in Armenia and Parthia. To Bactria he had conceded independence only because as an independent state it was a buffer between Hellenism and the Scythian barbarians, with whom its Greek rulers threatened to make common cause rather than submit to the Seleucid. The position continued substantially unchanged during the reign of Epiphanes, though he found it necessary to march armies into both Armenia and Persia.

Demetrius I, nephew of Epiphanes and son of Seleucus IV, who became king in 162, gained the title of Soter (saviour) by crushing in 160 a dangerous revolt in Media, whose satrap had assumed the royal title. Very soon after this, however, Demetrius found himself forced to fight for his crown, and in the period of dynastic chaos that ensued Armenia dropped away, and the Parthian Arsacids not only recovered independence but absorbed Media and Persia into their own dominion, of which the Euphrates became in effect the boundary. In 138 Demetrius II, the

son of Demetrius I who had been killed in 150, attempted to recover the lost territory, but was defeated and himself taken captive by the Parthians. The Parthian Empire, which was to prove an endless and unsubduable source of trouble for Rome, had thus definitely come into being only a few years before Rome's first actual acquisition of Asiatic territory.

The same Parthian king who captured Demetrius penetrated into India and apparently claimed to have added the old Persian satrapy of India to his dominions, but the brief conquest—so called—did not survive his death in 136. In this direction the kings of Bactria had preceded those of Parthia. Demetrius of Bactria, son and successor of that Euthydemus whom Antiochus III had reluctantly confirmed in the Bactrian kingdom, actually made himself king in Afghanistan and a considerable part of the Punjab; and, though he lost his crown about 175, various Graeco-Bactrian principalities seem to have achieved an ephemeral existence in this region during the next forty years. The most notable of these invaders was Menander, who about 175 carried victorious arms as far as the mouth of the Indus in one direction and the Jumna in another. Here however he was held up and driven back by the Sunga king, who in 185 had snatched the crown from the

last of the Mauryas. But Bactria itself was crumbling under the pressure of the central Asian nomads.

No Bactrian dominion was established in India; Hellenism in its far eastern outpost was submerged and wiped out, leaving only a dim memory of itself here and there among the peoples of the East. The mainly Mongolian nomads, held off from the west by the Parthian barricade, now filtered and now flooded southwards, sometimes conquering, commonly destroying, never constructing, never organizing, always melting indistinguishably away after a brief apparition. At this stage their movement may be at least in part attributed to the impediment imposed on their penetration eastward by the recent construction of the Great Wall of China recorded in Chronicle VII, and to the progressive organization of the Chinese Empire begun under Shih Hwang Ti and continued under the Han dynasty (c. 205 B.C.-A.D. 225), whose princes were now actually endeavouring to learn something of the world beyond the mountains which encircled their realm. India fades out of our vision. Little can be with confidence affirmed concerning it, save that the brief ascendancy of Buddhism passed with the Maurya dynasty, and Brahmanism recovered its sway. Virtually for centuries world history is the history of Rome.



VIVID AND DELICATE CARVING BY AN ANCIENT CHINESE ARTIST

Culture progressed rapidly in China under the Han monarchs; there was a great increase of wealth and art flourished. On this slab of stone, cut during the Han period (c. 205 B.C.-A.D. 225), two separate episodes are represented. In the upper panel is seen a two-storeyed pavilion in which the Taoist goddess, Hsi Wang Mu, receives the ancient emperor Mu Wang. In the lower an official procession is depicted—a mandarin in his state chariot (extreme right) preceded by officials and soldiers.

*From Chavannes, 'Les sculptures chinoises en pierre'*

# THE SPIRIT OF REPUBLICAN ROME

The Temper in which the City on the Tiber  
faced the Problems of Adversity and Success

By JOSEPH WELLS

Warden of Wadham College, Oxford, 1913-27; Author of *A Short History of Rome*

JUDAS had heard the fame of the Romans, that they were mighty and valiant men. . . . Yet for all this none of them wore a crown, or was clothed in purple, to be magnified thereby: Moreover how they had made for themselves a senate house, wherein three hundred and twenty men sat in council daily, consulting alway for the people, to the end they might be well ordered: And that they committed their government to one man every year . . . and that all were obedient to that one, and that there was neither envy nor emulation among them.'

Such praises and many more with reference to their bravery and their loyalty to their friends are the record of the Jewish chronicler of the Maccabæan period, writing rather less than a century after Rome had defeated Hannibal and shown herself to be indisputably the strongest power in the Mediterranean. The picture is an idealised one, but it was largely true when this period begins. It was because it was true that Rome had survived the attack of the greatest general of the old world and his professional army, and had risen superior to a succession of defeats, every one of which would have crushed any other state of ancient times.


The main features of the Roman spirit are all emphasised in this picture, four of which stand out prominent—their bravery, their loyalty to their allies, their willingness to merge all power in a council, and the absence of personal ambition.

Of these features perhaps the position of the Roman Senate is the most striking; at any rate it most impressed the imagination of the world. The Senate at Rome, like the senate of Venice, seemed in its great days to represent the ideal of states-

manship. Unchanging in its policy, superior to personal ambition, acting up to a high standard of justice, it was an 'assembly of kings,' but of kings who worked for the state and not for themselves. The Second Punic War had seen attempts to break from this tradition, but the stern logic of defeat had checked all such vagaries. The disruptive force of wealth had as yet hardly begun to affect this unity. Polybius, writing more than half a century later, tells us that a Roman, if he gave merely his pledged word, could be trusted with enormous wealth; while no number of seals or witnesses could keep a Greek from embezzling any sum, however trifling, entrusted to him. And he adds a feature, omitted by the Jewish chronicler, to whom all pagan creeds were as naught: to a Roman his religion was still a moral force, a thing of 'mysterious terrors' (see Chap. 60).

It is natural to choose the second century B.C. as the period in which the spirit of the Roman Republic can be most clearly examined, The Republic  
at its best for by that time the constitution had reached its full development; so Cicero in his political treatise, *De Republica* ('On the State'), chooses for the interlocutors in his dialogue the greatest statesman of this century, Scipio Aemilianus, and his friends. Into their mouths he puts his own views on the theory and the practice of the Roman constitution, and his views may certainly be taken to represent the views of the average Roman citizen. Cicero is not only the great master of the Latin tongue; his career and his methods are those which his countrymen especially admired.

The cardinal point in his constitutional views is the supremacy of the Senate; to him, as to most of his countrymen,



FASCES OF THE ROMAN LICTORS

As a symbol of the 'imperium,' or power of life and death, wielded by the chief Roman magistrates, their attendants the lictors bore bundles ('fasces') of rods with an axe bound therein.

Left, a wall relief; right, a reconstruction.

*British Museum (left)*

S.P.Q.R.—Senatus Populusque Romanus—was the proper style of the state; and it will be noted that 'the Senate' comes before 'the People.' The people elected the magistrates; it had the sovereign voice to decide on war and peace; but the Senate and the magistrates generally controlled its decisions.

This arrangement was based upon the principle which is fundamental in everything Roman—the respect for the 'mos majorum,' the custom of our forefathers. A Roman did not wish to change his state, he wanted to develop it on the old lines, and, consciously or unconsciously, he felt this could best be done by putting control in the hands of the 'body of old men' (the Senate), who had had experience of the state in the past, and who could guide the executive officers.

The Romans, however, were far too wise to think that authority can be actually exercised by a committee; the theory of the Roman state was that the elect of the people, the magistrates, had the 'imperium,' the supreme power, and the rods and axes of their attendants, the lictors, were the symbol that showed this

power to extend to 'life and death.' But this supreme authority was not to be used in Rome itself; there it was limited by being divided between the magistrates, by the right of appeal to the people in capital cases, and above all by the tradition that the magistrate was to take the advice of the Senate.

During the best days of the Republic, that is, till the middle of the second century B.C., when old traditions began to break down, from causes which will be briefly stated later, the Roman compromise worked well. Her magistrates, the elect of the people, were not at the beck and call of the assemblies like Athenian officials; it was even an open question whether a magistrate, however ill he might have behaved, could be removed before his time of office was over. In theory, although it was the people which had chosen him, his authority was derived from his predecessor, who 'created' him. In fact it might be said that there was a magisterial 'succession' at Rome; the mystic grace of the supreme authority was inherited from the long-past days of the kingship, and it was transmitted from year to year by one holder of an annual office to another.

It will be obvious how the three theories of sovereignty which have been mentioned combine to secure to the Roman government the maximum of efficiency. Authority had its origin in the mysterious past; the people decided who was to exercise it for the year; and the embodied wisdom of previous generations was always present to assist, and if necessary to constrain, the actual holder of executive power. The famous theory of Polybius that the strength of the Roman government lay in its being 'mixed,' that the magistrates represented Monarchy, the Senate Aristocracy, and the assemblies Democracy, is true in the sense given above. And the theory and the practice of the constitution largely agreed during the greater part of the second century. The Senate, as has been said, was really the ruling power in Rome till 123 B.C., when C. Gracchus used his position as tribune to appeal to the people direct, and, setting all traditions at defiance, ruled

Rome as the people's representative during his first tribunate (see Chap. 64).

In foreign policy especially the senatorial government was supreme. It is in the second century B.C. that the Roman Republic built up its provincial empire. The foundations of this had been laid as

the result of the First Punic War, which gave the Foreign policy of the Senate conquerors the first provinces, Sicily and (shortly afterwards) Sardinia and Corsica; the two Spains, in theory though by no means completely, were the prize of the Second Punic War. All these acquisitions—it could be and it was claimed—had been forced on Rome as necessary for her defence.

In the half century which followed the Second Punic War Rome's policy was one of hesitation. War after war was fought, but they were at least half defensive, and though the Romans crushed their enemies in the East, Macedonia and Syria, as they had crushed Carthage in the West, they did not at first annex any territory. But circumstances were too strong for them, especially when the ambition and greed of individuals also tended to promote aggression and the addition of provinces. So, as the result of the Third Punic War, as had happened after each of the previous wars with Carthage, a great increase of territory was gained: Africa, Macedonia, Achaea, all became provinces in 146, and thirteen years later Asia was added by bequest. Rome was supreme in the western Mediterranean and in the Aegean.

It would almost be true to say that the list of the provinces of the Republic ends here. It is true that the conquests of Pompey and Caesar almost doubled the extent of Rome's dominions; but the provinces then added were the result of proconsular power, not of senatorial diplomacy; in the winning of them the force was built up which was soon to overthrow the Republic. The Senate had built up the dominion of Republican Rome, but in doing so had created the semi-professional army which enabled the proconsul to make himself master of the central government.

There is great discussion among historians whether Roman policy during this three-quarters of a century (201–123 B.C.)

was deliberately one of aggrandisement, or whether the Roman Senate honestly tried to avoid annexation of more provinces, but found itself overcome by the force of circumstances. Probably both views are true—there were, that is to say, two policies in the Senate and among the Roman nobility, and first one and then the other prevailed. Either view is consistent with the careful and far-seeing diplomacy for which Machiavelli professes so much admiration when, in *The Prince*, he describes the methods by which the power and territory of a state may be increased.

He demonstrates and illustrates how it was always the Roman practice to have an ally on the spot, to watch and to warn of any danger that might arise from enemies like Carthage and Macedon, which, though decisively beaten, might again become formidable. These allies were a sure cause of international friction, for, secure in Roman protection, they were continually quarrelling with their powerful neighbours, who had once been Rome's enemies. Such an ally was Masinissa of Numidia in Africa against Carthage, and such was Rhodes in the Aegean against the kingdoms of Macedon and Syria.

And in Rome's protection of them there was something more than mere selfishness. She claimed to be the champion of small



COIN THAT SHOWS THE FASCES

L. Junius Brutus, first consul of the Republic, followed by lictors bearing the fasces, appears on a coin of M. (C. Caepio) Brutus, whose murder of Caesar showed the same republican fervour.

*British Museum*

states, and, as was seen in the opening of this chapter, the Jewish chronicler, at any rate, admitted the justice of this claim, and admired Rome because of it. It is true that these states all, sooner or later, found that their alliances with Rome became more and more unequal, and tended to pass into subjection. Rome grew ever stronger and her old enemies weaker; hence her need for dependent allies grew less, while

at the same time alliance  
Alliances replaced with Rome tended to  
by annexation spread Roman influence  
in the client states,

and thus to prepare the way for annexation. So the kingdom of Pergamum, Rome's firm ally in Asia Minor, became, after generations of alliance, the province of 'Asia,' and this development was repeated over and over again later. A very similar feature marks the growth of the British Indian Empire, and if one charges Rome with hypocrisy, one must bring the same charge against the East India Company, and, indeed, against the British Raj. Such charges of hypocrisy and of deliberate aggrandisement are indeed often brought by foreigners against England; they are due to prejudice or, rather, to historic ignorance; as historic knowledge widens, it becomes clear that it is a law of human nature, for nations as for individuals, that 'to him that hath shall be given,' even though he does not deliberately seek further gain. And, apart from this law of imperial growth, the ambition of individuals, as has been said, tended always to increase Rome's domains.


There were signs already in the second century B.C. that the authority of the Senate was on the wane. When a governor like Manlius Vulso in 189 B.C. made war on the Galatians without authority from the Senate (page 1691), when a consul like Marcus Popilius in 173 B.C. refused to obey the order of the Senate that he should compensate the Ligurians whom he wronged, and when he succeeded in escaping the punishment he deserved, it was clear that the good traditions were falling into decay. We have seen that elaborate provisions for the maintenance of balance of power existed in Roman government, but they could not be applied

in the provinces: the proconsul in them had no colleague to share his authority; the provincials had no right of 'appeal' against him; he was surrounded by a staff of his own choosing, and he had at his disposal soldiers who had taken the oath of obedience to him and not to the state, and who had everything to hope from him. It is no wonder that senatorial authority broke down.

And the failure is seen not only in aggression and annexation but also in misgovernment of provinces already annexed. The Roman authorities honestly tried to impose only fair burdens on their subjects and to secure justice for them if their legal rights were infringed. It may confidently be claimed that Roman provincial government became in the end the most just and impartial that the ancient world ever saw; it might be added that in the modern world few have equalled it and hardly any have surpassed it; but this success was not attained at once, and in fact not till the time of the Empire. Under the Republic there was the constant struggle between the greed of individuals and the tradition of the state that justice should be done.

A famous instance of this was the claim of the Spanish provincials for redress in 171 B.C., when M. Porcius Cato, the representative of old Roman morality, was  
Misgovernment of  
the provinces  
one of their 'advocates'; two of the noble  
Roman offenders retired into exile, but on the whole little seems to have been done. The failure of Roman government in the provinces, in spite of the desire of all that was best in Rome to put it right, is well seen in the Lex Calpurnia of 149 B.C., which established a special court to deal with cases of extortion ('de repetundis'). This seems to have been provoked especially by another case of gross misconduct in Spain, which had again moved the aged Cato to champion provincial rights.

It is significant that both these instances come from the same part of Rome's dominions; Spain was only gradually being reduced; it was a wealthy country, and it was far from Rome; hence, temptations were great and redress difficult.



#### TYPICAL ROMANS WHO SAW THE GREAT DAYS OF THE REPUBLIC

The genius of the Romans for portraiture was one of their most lasting contributions to art. The magnificent series of Imperial busts represented in every museum enables one to realize this, but even better than they in some ways are the splendid heads, mostly anonymous, that survive from Republican times. These four are quite early and admirably show the type of men and women who were the strength of Rome in the days when she was fighting for supremacy in the Mediterranean.

*Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen*



But if instances of Roman failure to secure justice can be multiplied in Spain, it is equally possible to produce from that province instances of good Roman government. The praetorship (180-179 B.C.) of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, the father of the two famous reforming tribunes, was a marked success; he established justice, he encouraged the inhabitants to adopt Roman civilization, and he gave opportunity for their military instincts by raising native forces and enlisting the chiefs in Roman service.

His efforts gave a long period of comparative peace to Hither Spain; more than forty years later his son Tiberius was welcomed by the Spaniards of Numantia as a mediator, and though his efforts failed for the time being, and Numantia was completely destroyed as a punishment for having been too successful against Rome, the work of Romanisation went on. It is significant that the first Latin colony outside Italy was founded in Spain—Carteia in 171 B.C.—and so that door was opened by which in the end all western Europe passed into the sphere of Roman citizenship. And the circumstances, too, were significant: the colonists were half-breeds, the children of Roman soldiers and Spanish women. A place was found for them in Roman organization, which made them part of the governing race, though in an inferior position.

The Romans did many great things, but the greatest of all was their creation of new nations. Spain was the first country in which the methods were adopted which rendered possible the proud boast of Rutilius four centuries later:

Urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat

—‘you made what was formerly the world a city.’ And though the province of Gaul and its transformation into France were the triumphs of the Empire, the foundations at all events of the Romanisation of the Iberian peninsula, and of its unification into Spain and Portugal, were the work of the Republic.

It was natural, in this chapter, to treat the government of the provinces first, as

this and the problems it presented were the most important parts of senatorial rule in the second century B.C.; but it must not be forgotten that the work was done on the lines that had been laid down in the two preceding centuries, and that Rome was able to unify western Europe because she had first succeeded in unifying Italy. It is true that all the country south of the Alps was geographically one, and that Rome was marked out by natural features as its capital; but it is equally true that the racial elements in it were most mixed, and that the Italian nation is as truly a creation of Rome as the French and the Spanish. The Latin and the Sabellian tribes were probably akin to her in race, but Etruscans beyond the Tiber (see Chap. 38), Ligurians in the Riviera, and Gauls all over North Italy, not to mention a plentiful admixture of Greeks in South Italy, presented a problem for unification which bristled with difficulties and which might have seemed insoluble.

The principles which Rome was to follow in solving it had been learned in the experience of the two preceding centuries, since the time when Rome, by conquering Veii (396 B.C.), had shown that Latin civilization and not Etruscan domination was to prevail. These principles were broadly the recognition of local independence, the avoidance of tribute, coupled with the requirement of military service, the careful graduation of privileges, so that every community had something it could hope to gain by good conduct, and, above all, the willingness to concede the highest reward, a share of Roman citizenship. Rome never made the mistake of Athens by touching the pockets of her dependent allies; she avoided too the other mistake of Athens, that of antagonising the leading men everywhere. The Roman Senate had the feelings and the prejudices of an aristocracy, and they knew how much interference the ruling classes of their neighbours would tolerate or even welcome. (For a full account of Rome's dealing with the other peoples of Italy see Chapter 53.)

And at the same time Rome wisely avoided anything like a cast-iron uni-

formity. It was easy to assimilate Latins and Sabines, and they were soon absorbed; but no attempt was made to Romanise Greeks, the Etruscan Lucumos were allowed to manage their own serfs, and the Gauls in North Italy had towns planted among them, but were largely left to the authority of their chiefs. Where a race like the Ligurians proved itself unteachable in its difficult mountain country, it was largely transported to the plains. One nation in Italy alone proved itself irreconcilable; the Samnites between 340 and 290 B.C. had given Rome her hardest struggles; they had joined Pyrrhus and Hannibal when they invaded Italy; they held out against all Rome's attempts at unification in the second century, and finally they had to be almost wiped out by Sulla, because in the Social War (90-88 B.C.) they fought to destroy Rome, when the rest of her allies were fighting to be allowed to join her.

But this is anticipating. It is necessary to speak in a little more detail of the way in which after 200 B.C. the Roman government applied in Italy (and also unwisely failed to apply) the principles of unification of which we have just spoken.

The Second Punic War had found Roman influence extended to the north of the Apennines and beginning to penetrate to the valley of the Po. The

**Roman Rule in Italy** first task of the government therefore, when the war was over, was to secure that valley, and then to reduce the Ligurians, who commanded the difficult access to Italy along the north-west coast. The work was mainly done by the old method, the foundation of colonies with a great road to connect them. In the first twenty years of the second century B.C. nineteen colonies were founded; of these the larger number were in the south of Italy—Rome was apprehensive of Macedon, and wished to secure herself against another invasion from Greece like that of Pyrrhus a century before. Three of the rest were in the valley of the Po, and their modern representatives, Bologna, Parma and Modena, show how well Rome chose her sites for occupation; she could found cities which were to last as well as she could make nations.

Aquileia in the north-east of Italy, the predecessor of Venice, soon followed; and the great Via Aemilia, reaching right across the plain of Lombardy (187 B.C.) was the chain which bound these new colonies together, along with the older ones, Milan, Cremona, Piacenza (to give them their modern names), which Rome had planted in the preceding generation. 'We have no ancient account,' says Heitland, 'of this policy as a whole . . . this is a specimen of the way in which the Senate made history that was probably never written.'

But while the Roman government in this old way was strengthening its hold on Italy, it was departing from another of the most important of the old traditions; the **Privileges of the methods of easy access** **Allies** curtailed to the Roman citizenship were abandoned; the convenient status of half-citizenship ('*civitas sine suffragio*'—citizenship without the vote), which had been invaluable as making easier transition from alliance to full privilege, was given up. No more such citizens were made, and those already existing were rapidly absorbed into the body of full citizens. So the gap between Rome and her allies was widened, or rather, it should be said, the bridges provided for the easy crossing of this gap were broken down.

And along with the growing separation between the ruling state and her dependent allies went a corresponding diminution of their privileges. The old right of 'migration' to Rome was limited; the burdens of military service were increased, and the Romans began to show a tendency to choose the easier campaigns in the East for their own troops, and to send their allies to provinces like Spain and Sardinia, where there was little booty and much danger both in fighting and from disease. Ugly stories also begin to be told about the insolence of Roman magistrates, who treated Italians as if they had no rights at all, as, for example, the well-known tale of the Italian magistrate who was flogged because the town bath of Teanum did not please the wife of the Roman magistrate travelling through. The old traditions were breaking down in Italy as well as in the Provinces.

But though things were certainly not improving, we must be careful not to exaggerate the decay of good government. We get our pictures of official insolence and of violated rights mainly from oratorical sources—the story referred to just above comes from a speech of C. Gracchus, when denouncing the Senate—and a very small acquaintance with politics is needed to make us discount largely the accusations of an opposition speaker. The great facts must always be remembered that the Roman allies in Italy had arms in their hands, that armed men do not tolerate systematic oppression, and that when Italy did revolt finally, half of it refused to move, and remained loyal to Rome. Here, as everywhere in history, the tendency is for the evil exceptions to be remembered and for the good, which is the rule, to be taken for granted and left unmentioned.

But making all allowances for this principle, and recognizing that Rome in the second century B.C. still had the best government in the old

**Evil influences** world, yet the fact remains  
**in the State** that there was much amiss with the Roman Republic,

both in the provinces and in Italy. It was still far from the collapse of the next century, when it was necessary for Julius Caesar to sweep away a corrupt oligarchy. Several matters, however, of great importance must be mentioned, with regard to which keen anxiety was felt by the most far-seeing of Rome's statesmen. The life of Marcus Porcius Cato was one long struggle against the evil influences which seemed to him to be ruining the state; but we may admit that his conservatism was excessive, and that he was as bitter against the good elements in Greek culture as against corrupting elements. No such charge of obscurantism, however, can be brought against the second great Scipio, Aemilianus, the destroyer of Carthage, who was himself the centre of Greek culture in Rome and the friend and host of the famous historian Polybius; yet as censor in 142 B.C. he astonished his countrymen by asking, in his official prayer, no longer that the possessions of the state might be extended, but that they 'might be preserved.'

It remains, then, to consider what the evil signs were which made far-sighted statesmen fear that 'Roma Immortalis' might prove only mortal.

Perhaps the feature which distressed Roman statesmen most was the decay in population. Since the first days of the Republic there had been a steady increase, except during the terrible times of the Punic Wars; but from 159 B.C. onwards this increase had ceased, and on the contrary a steady decline had begun.

And it was not only in numbers that there was a falling off; the balance of population was being altered for the worse. The yeoman farmers, tilling their own land, who had been the strength of Rome's armies, were the element that was decreasing, and already the capital was beginning to attract that crowd of worthless idlers, who could neither fight nor work, who in fact lived on the state; it often provided them with food, and it more and more, from generation to generation, established festivals and games for their amusement. In Rome the cry for 'panem et circenses'—bread and 'games'—was not yet established as part of its normal life, but there were at least the beginnings of it.

It is worth while considering briefly the causes of this change in the distribution of population, for some of them, at all events, operate in our modern life, and help to swell the overgrown populations of our modern cities.

It is commonly said that the Hannibalic Wars ruined Italy; at least half of it was laid waste by hostile armies. It is said also that the Roman soldiers, demoralised by long  
**Causes of rural** warfare, did not care to  
**decay in Italy** return to their farms, and

above all that the competition of state-grown corn from the provinces ruined the Roman farmer, who was unable to sell his corn at a profit. The first of these causes might have been, by itself, merely transitory in effect; for Rome, if she had still been what she was in the preceding century, would have recovered as rapidly as England did after the Napoleonic War. And little importance can be attached to the effects of foreign competition; the ancient farmer grew corn


for his own livelihood, not to sell. His food, his fuel, his clothes were all produced at home, and he had not the burdens of rent, of rates and of education which crush out so many modern farmers.

The second cause mentioned above, however, if generalised, is, in part at least, the real cause of the decay in Rome's rural population; modern experience has taught us that it is hard for a man who has been a soldier for years to return to his old pursuits, and the Second Punic War was followed by a long series of wars, all of which kept Rome's farmer soldiers away from home for long periods, often for many years. When we add the attractions of a growing capital, where life was much easier and where advancement might be won by the ambitious, and when we consider that the great network of roads with which the Romans drew Italy together, and abolished distance to some extent, as do our modern railways to a far greater extent, we are not surprised that there was a steady drift of the rustic citizens towards Rome. This must not be

exaggerated; the Horatian farmer who 'spends each day on his own hillside' was still a familiar figure in second-century Italy, and he remained so in many parts of it even in the time of the Empire; but it is true that the drift of population citywards was constantly towards Rome.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

And this change in the distribution of population had two further results, which caused anxiety to thinking citizens. There was a deterioration in the Roman armies; the legionaries who in the war with Pyrrhus met death 'with all their wounds in front' were the sons of the soil; of the Roman soldier in the second century an almost contemporary writer (Sallust) said that he was a 'terror only to his friends, a prey to his enemies.' The fact that every campaign opened with disasters was only too patent, and the once invincible Roman armies failed disastrously both in Spain and especially against the northern barbarians, the Cimbri and the Teutones,



**HARDY OFFSPRING OF THE SOIL SUCH AS GAVE ITALY HER GREATNESS**

In Italy the real strength of the country lay in its yeoman farmers; and it was largely dissatisfaction with the labour of the soil bred by long foreign campaigns, together with the cityward tendency of the population, that produced the economic misery of late Republican times. But these causes can be exaggerated; and even in the last century B.C. figures like this sixth-century farmer and his wife, of Etruscan workmanship, must have been far from uncommon.

*Museo di Villa Giulia, Rome; photo, Altinari*


who in the last decades of the second century B.C. seemed only too likely to anticipate the work of destruction which their descendants of kindred race accomplished five hundred years later. A new Roman army had to be created by Marius, and it saved Rome and civilization; but it was not composed of good citizens like the armies that faced Hannibal. It was, or very soon became, a professional army.

The second evil result of the change in population was the growth of the number of slaves; these were needed for agricultural work in Italy, and Roman conquests and the spread of piracy made them cheap. Hence their numbers increased to a dangerous extent. It is true that the first two great slave risings were in Sicily (135-132 and 103-99 B.C.), where things were much worse than in Italy. But there was trouble on the mainland also from slaves at intervals in the second century, which gave warning of the

terrible rising under Spartacus in the first century; and, apart from this, it is impossible to exaggerate the evil done to Roman character by the slave population. Slavery is always degrading, and this especially was the result in Rome, where its horrors were at this time not mitigated by any of the palliations which were found for modern slavery.

The decrease of population, the decay of Roman agriculture, the deterioration in the Roman armies, the increase of slavery, were all disquieting signs, and men began to criticise the rule of the Senate under which these evils had grown up. In the Senate itself there was a reform party, the members of which saw that all was not well, and were prepared for moderate change. Their proposals, as, for example, a series of laws introducing the ballot, were unimportant, and when finally one of them, C. Laelius, ventured as praetor (145 B.C.) to propose a far-reaching law dealing with the land problem, he met so much resistance from the propertied interests that he withdrew and so earned the title of *Sapiens* ('prudent'). But the condition of Rome was fast becoming such as to need a reformer who would cast 'prudence' to the winds.

The truth was that the Roman Senate, like other bodies and institutions in Rome, was changing for the worse. Recruited as it was from ex-magistrates, the elect of the people, it was an 'aristocracy' in the best sense of the word; it was, to use the phrase of Aristotle, the government of the state by the best men for the benefit of all. But when the dangerous times of the Punic Wars were left behind, the whole conception of office at Rome gradually changed. Men were usually elected to office, not because they were best qualified for it, but because their fathers had held office before them, because, to use the Roman phraseology, they were 'nobles.' The old distinction between Patrician and Plebeian



THE HORRORS OF ROMAN SLAVERY

With foreign conquest the slave population grew enormously, and the Roman, on the whole, seems to have possessed little of that broad humanity which made the life of a Greek slave quite tolerable. Above, a terrible scourge loaded with bronze beads; below, two small bronzes showing slaves in 'cangues.'

British Museum

had become meaningless, but there had grown up this new distinction, and election outside the charmed circle of a certain number of 'gentes' was very rare.

So completely, in fact, had the idea become established that high office was a privilege to be claimed, not a duty to be performed, that laws were passed regulating the succession to it. The first of these, the *Lex Bœbia Annalis* (180 B.C.), fixed a certain age for each magistracy, and an interval between the times when they could be held; thirty years later a law seems to have been passed forbidding re-election to the consulship altogether. When Rome in a crisis needed her best man, Scipio Aemilianus, he had to be 'dispensed' from this law. It need hardly be said that when Rome found herself once more in deadly peril from the northern barbarians, these artificial barriers were swept aside, and the 'new man,' C. Marius, was elected consul five times in succession, that he might save Rome.

But through much of the second century the consulship was eagerly sought as a source of gain, and so not unnaturally the 'noble' competitors

increase of electoral corruption were prepared to pay for it by flagrant bribery, and the ordinary Roman citizens, who had no chance of office themselves, looked on their votes as a valuable, because saleable, commodity. Laws were passed against this electoral corruption, but their frequent re-enactment with increasing penalties shows how ineffective they were.

The deterioration in the Roman spirit has been traced in several fields—in the government of the provinces and in the army, in the relations of Rome with her allies in Italy, in the magistrates and in the people. It is now necessary to try to indicate some of the causes for this



#### VICTIMS OF ROME'S DEGENERACY

The earliest symptom of the decay of Roman morals was a growing addiction to gladiatorial combats. This terracotta lamp shows the equipment of the 'Samnite,' a heavily armed gladiator.

*British Museum*

decay, which was ruining a spirit that had been so great. Perhaps we may put first among them the decay of Roman religion. The time has gone by when it was the fashion to speak of this as a set of mere forms with no relation to life; as Warde Fowler, the greatest English authority on the subject, wrote, 'in the earliest times, in the old Roman family and then in the budding state, the whole life of the Roman seems inexplicably bound up with his religion.' It is true, however, that, as he says, while the 'simple religion of the family' (treated in Chapter 60) went on, 'the Roman state gained

the world and lost her own soul.'

That this happened was due in part to Greek philosophy; but the influence of this has been exaggerated; the matter, however, is discussed in Chapter 67. Some of the best men in Rome were the most philosophic, and those who adopted the shallow philosophy of Euhemerus, who argued that the gods were only dead men deified, and therefore of no account, rather adopted this creed to justify their evil lives than were led into evil lives by adopting it. The causes of the decay of Roman beliefs were more general. Not least among them was the great influx of wealth which came in from the campaigns in the East, and which was in itself most dangerous to the simplicity of old Roman morals. It was especially noted that the campaigns against Antiochus and the Galatians in Asia (190 and 189 B.C.) brought great wealth, and corruption along with it, into Rome.

New cults then, the increase of wealth, wider intercourse with other nations, were causes weakening the old Roman standards. How serious the effects were is strikingly shown by the scandal about the Bacchanalia (186 B.C.). It was found that an association for the propagation

of the rites of Bacchus had spread widely in Rome and Italy; people of the highest rank were involved in it, and the orgies were offensive in the extreme. A special commission had to be appointed to stamp it out (the inscription recording the decree of the Senate establishing this body is one of the oldest we have), and thousands of persons were executed.

A further striking proof of the decay in Roman morals at this time is the increase in public shows, and particularly those of the most degrading kind; the duration of the 'Roman games,' which in the early days of Rome had been but one day, was now increased to ten. Wild-beast shows and Greek athletes were introduced in 186 B.C.; and, above all, the bloody gladiatorial shows, which became so dear to all Romans, were greatly developed in the second century, though they had been introduced more than half a century before (264 B.C.). It was in vain for the Roman Senate to order stone theatres to be pulled down, as contrary to public morality; the shows went on all the same in temporary wooden booths.

But it is not right to end with Roman failures and Roman sins. The evidence that we have deals mainly with the extent of these; but the fact remains that

in Rome itself, and still more in Italy, the great mass of the people still had the great Roman qualities. The breakdown of government which began in the second century, and which came to a climax in the Civil Wars from 49 to 31 B.C., ended in the establishment once more of a strong and good government; and when this was established, it was seen once more that Rome had conquered the world because she understood how to govern as no preceding state had done.

Scipio's prayer as Censor has been referred to above; it, or something like it, became part of Roman state ritual. We can still read the inscription, found at Rome towards the end of the last century, which describes the Secular Games, established by Augustus in 17 B.C., to commemorate the 'peace' of the Empire. This gives the exact words of the emperor's prayer to the Fates, that they would 'protect ever the Latin name . . . give safety, victory and health to the Roman people, and preserve the Republic of the people of Rome.' Who can deny that the prayer was heard and answered? There is truth in the familiar saying that in the modern world 'nothing moves which is not derived from Greece, nothing stands which is not derived from Rome.'



**REPRESENTING THE MIDDLE-CLASS BACKBONE OF ROMAN SOCIETY**

A grave-relief of the first century B.C. shows us with incisive characterisation a man and his wife, Publius Aedius Amphio and Fausta Melior. They are typical of those unremembered worthies who must have made Roman history, though Roman history has so little to tell of them; neither patrician, freedman nor slave, but honest members of solid, well-to-do middle-class families.

*Berlin Museum*

# THE WAR-CRAFT OF THE ROMANS

Tactics and Equipment of the Armies  
that won the Ancient World for Rome

By T. RICE HOLMES Litt.D. D.Litt. F.B.A.

Author of *The Roman Republic*, *The Founder of the Empire*, etc.

WHILE the Roman military organization underwent various changes during the regal, republican and imperial periods, certain features remained throughout substantially the same. The legion, whose nominal strength was gradually increased from three thousand to six thousand men, formed until the time of Marius a brigade, in which cavalry and light-armed auxiliaries were incorporated. Every citizen of military age was liable to service, and before the siege of Veii (396 B.C.), when it became necessary to remain on duty throughout the winter, received no pay.

Originally each legion was commanded by six officers called military tribunes, each of whom held control in turn. But in the declining Republic they often owed their appointment not to merit, but to interest; and Caesar, though he of course took care, with due regard to political exigencies, to choose the best men whom he could get, never placed a tribune at the head of a legion. The principal officers in the later Republic were the legates, or lieutenants of the commander-in-chief, whose functions varied according to circumstances and to the confidence which they deserved. A legate might be entrusted with the command of a legion, an army corps, or even, in the absence of his chief, the entire army; but before the imperial period the legion had no permanent commander. Pompey and Caesar were each empowered by special laws to choose their own legates.

The officers upon whom the efficiency of the troops mainly depended were the centurions. They were selected from the ranks—not always on the ground of fitness,

for dishonest generals sold their patronage—and their position has been compared with that of British non-commissioned officers; but their duties were in some respects more important. The centurions of the first cohort, who had attained their rank by promotion—occasionally, for distinguished service, at one bound—were regularly summoned, at least by Caesar, to councils of war; and the chief centurion of the legion might offer suggestions to the legate himself. Occasionally, indeed, a centurion rose to be a military tribune.

With the legions were associated contingents furnished by the Italian peoples whom Rome successively subdued and bound to herself as subject allies. Cavalry and other auxiliaries were sometimes hired from foreign lands; and in the war with Hannibal, when every available man was needed, slaves were allowed to volunteer and rewarded for faithful service with freedom.

The weakest point in the military system before the revolutionary period of the Republic was that consuls or proconsuls were appointed to command simply in virtue of their rank. Of the Romans it may be said that they often 'muddled through.' During the period of the great wars, if they were obliged to fight at sea, after first borrowing ships from Greek cities of southern Italy, they built their own—originally copying Greek or Carthaginian models—which were generally rowed by slaves or freedmen and manned by soldiers, of whom some were Roman citizens, others furnished by Italian dependent allies; but when Rome became





#### EQUIPMENT OF EARLY REPUBLICAN SOLDIERY

This handle of a bronze toilet box represents two soldiers wearing helmets and full uniforms, and grasping long spears, with a dead comrade borne between them. It was found at the half-Greek, half-Latin city of Praeneste, in a grave of the fourth century B.C., and the accoutrement is partly Greek.

Rome, Museo delle Terme; photo, Alinari

mistress of the Mediterranean, subject states, especially Rhodes and other Greek islands, were required to contribute fleets, and it was by such means that Pompey suppressed piracy. The lack of a permanent fleet, however, occasionally, as in the first Mithradatic war, caused disaster.

In the war with Jugurtha a radical change was introduced which, while it increased the efficiency of the army, produced important political results. When Rome was establishing her dominion over Italy, the soldiers could generally return home at the end of each campaign. But when Scipio Africanus was fighting in Spain, when Roman armies were engaged in Macedonia and Asia Minor, men were forced to remain on duty for successive years; their homesteads were neglected; they had no pensions to which to look forward; and military service became unpopular. Marius, therefore, called for volunteers from the poorest class of the community, which had not hitherto been called out except in extreme necessity. Attracted not only by pay equivalent

to that of a day labourer, but also by the hope of obtaining booty, they enlisted for a livelihood. Thus the national militia was transformed into a professional army, to which, in the later civil wars, legions of provincials, who received Roman citizenship, were occasionally attached; and although the principle of a standing army was not yet recognized by the state, standing armies continued to exist throughout the remaining period of the Republic. But since they were not connected with a permanent national institution, disasters resulted from the lack of governmental preparation, and the successes that were gained were due to the commanders alone. Every soldier, on enlistment, took the oath of obedience, not to the state, but to the general whom he was to serve; and it was to him that he looked

for the bounties and the allotments of land which, in default of a pension, would enable him to subsist when he should have served his time. The generals were the masters of the army, and the downfall of the Republic became inevitable. When Octavian, receiving the title of Augustus, reorganized the constitution, the professional army, being essential to the safety of the state, necessarily received official recognition; but its revolutionary character was unchanged. Augustus, who had raised it, led it to victory and rewarded it, remained its master, for it would not submit to senatorial control.

Armies dependent  
on their generals

Other important changes, which proved permanent, were made in the time of Marius. Italian cavalry virtually ceased to exist; for, in consequence of prolonged wars, the wealthier citizens, of whom it had been composed, became reluctant to serve. Thenceforth the mounted troops, not as a rule brigaded with the legions, were Gallic, Spanish, Thracian, Numidian

or German mercenaries, who served for the most part under their tribal chiefs, though individual squadrons were occasionally, and the whole divisions always, commanded by Roman officers. Pompey in his war with Caesar actually armed his own rustic slaves as cavalry. Light-armed Italians were employed no longer; and, while picked legionaries occasionally acted in conjunction with cavalry as light infantry, the regular auxiliaries—archers, slingers and targeteers armed with broadswords, who figured in various campaigns—were raised from Numidia, Crete, the Balearic Isles and other provincial lands. After 89 B.C., when Roman citizenship was granted to all the Italian allies, the distinction between citizen and allied soldiers of course vanished.

Since the main object of Augustus, when he became supreme, was to safeguard the frontiers of the Empire, many of which were far distant from the capital, an army composed of men who would serve for the active period of their

lives was more than ever necessary. The fleet, which he also reorganized, was divided into squadrons stationed in various ports. Besides the legions, to each of which a permanent commander was assigned, contingents were regularly furnished by client princes, and served on occasion near their own territories; while the auxiliaries, drawn mainly from the western provinces, were greatly increased in number and embodied in permanent corps. In the Pannonian rebellion, towards the end of the Augustan age, auxiliary regiments, which, in order to keep them contented, had been stationed near their homes, mutinied in sympathy with their countrymen. Augustus, mindful of the warning, imported regiments from Spain and other provinces into the disturbed region; and after the revolt of Civilis (A.D. 69-70) native troops regularly served in districts remote from those in which they had been raised. From the reign of Vespasian, when almost all the client kingdoms had become



#### LATIN WARRIORS OF THE THIRD CENTURY B.C.

Like the box in the opposite page these ivory plaques were found in a grave at Braeneste, but they date from the third century B.C. Latin warriors are figured on the large plaques; their armour and weapons are Greek, but are almost identical in detail with the Roman equipment. Soldiers similarly accoutred appear on two of the smaller plaques. The female figure between them may represent Venus, and the small plaque on the left shows Hercules, one foot on an overturned amphora.

Museo Villa Giulia; photo, Allinari



#### CENTURIONS IN PARADE UNIFORM

Centurions' uniform included tunic, cuirass of leather—plain or metal-scaled (right)—and decorative greaves. They carried a vine staff as symbol of office. Decorations included torques and metal plaques ('phalerae') worn on the breast and, highest of all, the 'corona civica,' an oak-leaf crown for saving a comrade's life in action.

*From Bonn Museum and Cagnat, 'Archéologie romaine'*

Roman provinces, their contingents were added to the auxiliaries, and were required to serve wherever they were needed.

Towards the end of the first century the system was adopted of protecting frontiers by ramparts and forts, of which the wall that connected the firths of Forth and Clyde and that which extended from the estuary of the Tyne to Solway Firth are familiar examples. But in the wars of the third century such defences were of no avail. The legions, isolated in their several provinces and losing the sense of

mutual dependence, ceased to feel that they belonged to one imperial army, and when, corrupted by lax discipline, they began to leave the defence of frontiers to auxiliaries, rapidly degenerated.

Let us now consider the operations of war. Ignoring for want of sufficient evidence the early period, in which the legions were formed in a phalanx, we may study the Punic wars, for which we have the guidance not only of Livy, but also of Polybius, and those which are illustrated by the writings of Caesar and his continuators.

The legion was divided into thirty companies, called maniples, each of which was composed of two centuries


numbering respectively, at their greatest strength, a hundred men. Before the time of Marius the tactical unit was the maniple, afterwards the cohort, which comprised three maniples. This change, however, will not affect our examination of tactical movements. The defensive armour of the legionary consisted of a helmet, a leathern cuirass protected by bands of metal, a shield and greaves; his weapons were a short, two-edged, cut-and-thrust sword and (from the time of Marius) a javelin. In the earlier period javelins were not



#### TIME-EXPIRED SOLDIERS TAKING THEIR DISCHARGE

This portion of a bas-relief of the first century B.C. depicts the 'honesta missio,' or discharge of soldiers who had served their time. On the left a clerk is entering the names of the men, who are already in civilian dress, in a book and giving them their 'tabulae missionis'—two-page booklets containing their certificates. Time-expired soldiers received from Augustus grants of land, for which he afterwards (A.D. 6) substituted cash payments—12,000 sesterces (about £120) for each man.

*The Louvre; photo, Giraudon*



**LIGHT CRUISER OF THE ROMAN FLEET COMING INTO ACTION**

Roman battleships of the line were hexiremes, quinqueremes, quadriremes and triremes. In the first century a.c. two new types of warship were introduced: the bireme shown above and the Liburnian. Both were light, fast vessels, used for both scouting and fighting, and also for the convoy of troops. The rowers were under cover from the missiles of the enemy, and towers were built forward from which missiles could be showered on the enemy's deck.

*The Liburnian: photo, Alinari*

used by the entire legion, the reserve still carrying spears. It was the introduction of the javelin in the second century of the Republic that put an end to the phalanx and led to the adoption of the open formation in which the Romans conquered. Slings were used by Caesar's legionaries in the campaign of Iberda, and bullets inscribed with the names of legions have been found in Italy.

Besides the legion, whose symbol from the time of Marius was the figure of an eagle, every company had its standard; and the several standards, essential for the direction of movements, were objects of a religious adoration which may be understood by those who have observed the flags displayed in S. Paul's Cathedral and



**FROM THE TOMB OF A CAVALRYMAN**

The equipment of the auxiliary cavalry comprised helmet, leather corselet, breeches and shoes. They were armed with long swords and thrusting lances as well as javelins, carried light shields and rode on two blankets fastened by a surcingle, breast strap and crupper, and rode without stirrups.

*Cologne Museum; from Raschkehoff, 'Rome,' Clarendon Press*

who remember how in the Zulu War two subalterns sacrificed their lives to save the colours of their regiment. Caesar in his narrative of the Civil War emphasised the loss of thirty-two standards at Dyrrachium, and it was not until the standards lost by Crassus were restored by the Parthians to Augustus that the disaster of Carrhae was atoned for.

Students of Roman history should bear in mind that it was generally impossible to force the commander of an

unit was the manipule—formed in three lines, in each of which the ranks as a rule stood eight deep, the third line forming a reserve. But once at least, in a combat which was not likely to be protracted, Caesar formed a small force in a single line; two lines were found enough by one of his ablest marshals when he offered battle with comparatively few troops to a Gallic enemy; and on the field of Pharsalus, for a special purpose, Caesar formed a



WHERE HADRIAN'S WALL SAFEGUARDED THE VALLEY OF THE TYNE

As completed under the direction of Hadrian's propraetor, Aulus Platorius Nepos, between A.D. 119 and 127, Hadrian's Wall extended for 73½ miles from the mouth of the Tyne to the Solway Firth. It was eight feet thick and nearly twenty feet high, and included 254 distinct fortified posts—fourteen forts each accommodating 500 to 1,000 men, 80 small mile-castles, and about 160 watch towers. The ruins shown here are of the west gateway of the fort at Boreovicium—the modern Housesteads.

*Photo, John Gibson*

ancient army to fight a decisive battle so long as he could feed his troops; for even if there was no hill or other defensible position accessible, the entrenchments of his camp could not be assaulted without excessive loss. This explains how the Dictator Fabius Maximus was able to gain time by keeping the field during a critical period in the presence of Hannibal. For the same reason, more than a century later, Sertorius, refusing to fight a battle and allowing his Spanish troops to pursue the guerrilla tactics to which they were accustomed, held his own against Metellus by persistently attacking his watering parties and harassing his foragers.

Before a battle a Roman army was generally—invariably when the tactical

fourth. Pompey had placed his cavalry, which was very numerous, on his left, being confident that by launching it against the exposed flank of Caesar's right wing he could instantly gain the victory; but Caesar, divining his purpose, frustrated it by detaching eight cohorts from his third line and posting them obliquely, concealed by his right wing, with orders to use their javelins as spears for stabbing the troopers in the face. Occasionally, when a small force was suddenly attacked by superior numbers, it was formed in a figure approximating more or less closely to a circle, so as to face the enemy on every side.

The accounts given by Polybius and Livy of the modes in which the maniples



#### VARIOUS SHAPES OF HELMET WORN BY ROMAN LEGIONARIES

The helmets of Roman legionaries were of divers shapes. The specimen (left) found near Berkhamstead is derived from the earlier Etruscan 'jockey cap' helmet of purely Italian origin. Its hinged cheek pieces are missing. Horsehair plumes or crests were only donned on the eve of an engagement. They were attached to wooden pegs and inserted in metal sockets on the helmet (centre). The Etruscan helmet of Attic shape (right) had a pair of metal tubes to carry single feathers.

*British Museum*

were arranged in action have given rise to voluminous discussion. Needless to say that the formation varied according to circumstances; but in handbooks and dictionaries of antiquities one reads that ordinarily the several divisions, whether maniples or cohorts, in each line were separated from one another by intervals equal to the breadth of each, and that the divisions of the second line stood behind the intervals in the first. Various writers, admitting that before


the last century of the Republic intervals were left in the first stage of a battle to allow the light-armed troops to move to and fro, insist that from the moment when hand-to-hand fighting began the intervals were closed, either by extending the ranks or by the advance of the divisions in the second line into the intervals of the first; for, they argue, if intervals had been left in the fighting line, the enemy would have rushed through, attacked the divisions in flank and rear,



#### ARMS AND ARMOUR OF THE ROMAN INFANTRYMAN

The gravestone (centre) presents a legionary soldier in full uniform with his javelin ('pilum'), shield and sword. As shown in the relief (left) from Trajan's column, the shields bore the badges of the various legions. The bronze statuette (right) shows the construction of the flexible cuirass, overlapping bands of metal fastened down the centre, with shoulder pieces of similar construction and straps on the shoulder to keep the armour in place.

*Centre, Wiesbaden Museum, from Rodenstaff, 'Roma'; Claudian Press; right, British Museum*



#### SWORD, SCABBARD AND SPEARS FROM ROMAN BATTLEFIELDS

This weapon, found at Mainz, and perhaps a presentation sword of honour to one of Germanicus's officers, is a fine example of the late Roman legionary's sword. The iron blade is twenty-one inches long and two and a half inches wide at the base, and the scabbard was of wood with a sheathing of silver gilt decorated with reliefs (centre, enlarged) in gilt bronze. On the right are three iron spearheads; below them, five bronze and iron spear butts of varying types.

*British Museum*

and destroyed the whole formation. But, as an Austrian officer, Colonel Veith, remarks, it would have been very dangerous for an enemy to penetrate between two intact divisions, especially as there was a third in reserve behind. The formation imagined by those who deny that intervals existed in action would have been merely a bastard phalanx—a phalanx with all its defects and none of its advantages. What would happen if it encountered a phalanx properly so called? The phalanx, by dint of its superior weight, would inevitably break the line; intervals would be formed perforce; and the fragmentary groups, driven back and shattered, would

prevent their own reserves from acting. If, on the other hand, intervals had been left deliberately, any portion of the phalanx that attempted to penetrate would be exposed in flank and rear.

Veith, however, is not concerned to prove that the chessboard formation of the legion with maniples or cohorts ranged obliquely—four cohorts in the first line, three in the second, and three in the third—was unalterable; or that the intervals were necessarily equal to the breadth of a cohort; or even that intervals greater than what sufficed to mark the individuality of the several cohorts invariably existed. On the contrary, he argues that as the battle neared its

decisive phase, the fighting line must have tended, by the successive incorporation of reserves, to approach continuity. Citing a passage in which Polybius observes that elasticity enabled the legion to defeat the degenerate Macedonian phalanx, Veith shows that the essence of Roman tactics was to arrange the troops in a manner which would make it possible to bring into action groups of any required strength and in any formation at any point and at any moment.

Consider a few instances. Livy relates that Scipio Africanus before the battle of Zama (see page 1665) 'did not form his cohorts in close order, but drew up his maniples at considerable intervals, in order that there might be room for the enemy's elephants to pass without breaking the formation'—a statement from which it may perhaps be inferred that at that time, in the belief of Livy, the normal intervals between maniples were not more than sufficient to mark their individuality. Polybius says that on the same occasion Scipio formed the second line in such a way that the maniples did not cover the intervals between those in the first line, 'as the Roman custom is' (a remark which suggests that the normal intervals equalled the breadth of the maniples), but were posted directly behind them at some distance 'on account of the multitude of the enemy's elephants.'




BRONZE SHOULDER PLATE

To protect the right shoulder, which was not covered by the shield, bronze disks were attached to the leather cuirasses of such legionaries as were not equipped with laminated shoulder straps. This specimen measures  $5\frac{1}{2}$  inches in diameter.

*From Schullen, 'Numantia,' Bruckmann*

He also relates that in this battle, after the preliminary skirmishing (by the auxiliaries), the first line attacked the Carthaginians; then the second advanced; and finally the three lines fought in unison. 'Scipio,' he says, 'ordered the "principes" and "triarii" [the second and third lines] to take close order and deploy with the "hastati" [the first line] on either flank.' Clearly the words




DAGGERS AND PILA OF THE ROMAN ARMY

The principal arm of the Roman infantry was the pilum, an iron rod, the length of which in the time of Caesar was less than 3 feet, terminating in a pointed blade and attached by a tang to a wooden shaft. If the point pierced a shield it bent and could not readily be extracted; the shield became an encumbrance; the weapon could not be used by the enemy; and the legionary was free to use his sword, or sometimes the short dagger (top) which he also carried.

*From Adolf Schullen, 'Numantia,' Bruckmann A.G.*





## REGIMENTAL ENSIGNS

The standard of the legionary cohort (left, and below) was a silver-plated pole, pointed for planting in the ground, and adorned with regimental honours. Animals (right) and other emblems distinguished the standards of the legions.

British Museum and Cognat, 'Archéologie romaine'

'to take close order' imply that previously their order had not been close, and confirm the impression left by Polybius's earlier statement, that even after the auxiliaries had done their work the intervals between the maniples remained.

His account of the battle of Cannae (see page 1658) is also instructive. There the Roman general 'stationed the maniples closer together than usual,' and since he 'placed the light troops in advance of the whole army,' it is evident that they did not occupy the diminished intervals before close fighting began, and that the maniples stood closer than usual when and after it began; in other words that, as a rule, the intervals that separated them, even in the heat of battle, were considerable. A passage in which Polybius compares the Roman order of battle with the degenerate Macedonian phalanx explains how it was practicable to fight in groups:

Whether the phalanx . . . drives its opponents from their ground or is itself driven back, its peculiar order is dislocated; for alike in following the retreating, or flying from the advancing enemy, they quit the remaining divisions of their force, and when this happens, the enemy's reserves can occupy the space thus left and the ground which the phalanx had just before been holding, and . . . fall upon them on their flank and rear.

In general the size of the intervals must have depended upon circumstances which we cannot ascertain. The main point is that, as Polybius says, the Roman order of battle was 'flexible; for every Roman . . . is equally equipped for every place

and time, and for every appearance of the enemy. He is, moreover, quite ready and needs to make no change, whether he is called upon to fight in the main body, or in a detachment, or in a single manipule, or even by himself.'

In the times of Marius and Caesar (when the three lines were no longer called *hastati*, *principes* and *triarii*) there is no evidence that a line of battle was ever formed with considerable intervals, or that the auxiliary infantry ever opened the battle. They were used for various purposes—to defend a camp when the legions were in action, to shower arrows and sling bullets among troops crossing a river, to hinder watering parties, and so on. The first two lines apparently maintained their individuality in Caesar's battles after close fighting had begun, though as the combat neared its end the second may have become gradually incorporated with the first. In the battle in which he defeated the German king, Ariovistus, when the Roman left, overpowered by numbers, was giving



## ROMAN STANDARD BEARERS

On the left is a 'signifer' with the 'signum' or standard of his cohort; on the right an 'aquilifer' with the eagle—the standard of the legion. The uniforms belong to the 2nd century of our era, but may have been worn in the time of Caesar.

Lindenschmidt, and Roslovitzoff, 'Roma,' Clarendon Press

ground, the officer commanding the cavalry sent the third line on his own responsibility to the rescue. At Pharsalus, while the fourth line, after it had routed Pompey's cavalry, lapped round his left wing and attacked his infantry from behind, the third line advanced to support the first two, which in the stress of conflict had combined, and the battle was won.

A battle generally began with a discharge of missiles. The legionaries in the two front ranks threw their javelins, the blades of which, being made in the time of Caesar of soft iron, would bend when the points penetrated the enemy's shields. In the first battle which he fought in Gaul many of the enemy, finding their shields pinned together by the javelins, which, tug and wrench as they might, they could not extract, flung them away and parried the sword thrusts as best they could. While the two front ranks of the legions were using their swords, the rear ranks probably threw their javelins overhead.

The method by which individuals—perhaps also occasionally companies—in the fighting line were relieved can be explained with certainty. In a hardy contested battle the foremost ranks of the first line would become tired or thinned, and the gaps were filled by the advance of men from the rear ranks between the files of those in front. If it became necessary to relieve a manipule or a cohort as a whole, the relief was accomplished in the same way. When the third line was brought into action the cohorts that composed it, if they were not required to reinforce the second, could be directed against the enemy's flanks or rear.

Pompey was perhaps the only Roman general who ever attempted to defeat regular infantry with cavalry alone; but cavalry was used in many ways besides the pursuit of a beaten enemy. When Caesar in the penultimate stage of his seventh campaign in Gaul was surprised by Vercingetorix, he won the battle by launching a squadron of German horse, which he had hired, against his enemy's left flank; for he knew the truth of a maxim which Wolseley emphasised—'The charge of ten horsemen on the flank is more effective than that of a hundred on the front.' Three years later, when he



#### THE USE OF MAIL ARMOUR

A panel of Marcus Aurelius on the Arch of Constantine shows a variety of equipment. One soldier wears mail armour, which might be of ring-mail ('lorica hamata') or of small plates ('squamata'), and was often used by cavalry.


*Photo, Anderson*

was fighting in Spain against Pompey's marshals, and success depended upon his preventing them from reaching the Ebro, his cavalry which had before persistently harassed their foragers, and which at the moment was alone available, delayed the advance of their column so effectively that, as soon as he could bring his infantry into action, he was able to head them off and ultimately to force them to surrender. Repeatedly charging the rearguard or plying them with missiles, they trotted back to a safe distance as often as the harassed cohorts turned to bay, and then, swinging round, pursued again. In

his African campaign Caesar's movements were constantly impeded by his weakness in cavalry, while his former marshal, Labienus, who was then his bitterest enemy, commanding a large body of Numidian horse supported by active footmen, once nearly succeeded in surrounding his force, and on another occasion almost brought his column on a flank march to a standstill.

Although the Romans had no separate corps of engineers, every legion included artisans, who, when their special services were required, acted under staff-officers, executing repairs, planning fortifications and bridges, and probably also working the

delicate mechanism of the artillery. The various engines that composed this arm were due to Greek ingenuity, for Dionysius, the famous tyrant of Syracuse, owed his success largely to the inventions by which his engineers had perfected them; but though in the siege of Jerusalem they threw stones weighing about fifty-seven pounds more than four hundred yards, they were inferior, at least in the time of Caesar, to their prototypes. When Caesar's lieutenant, Trebonius, was besieging the Greek colony of Massilia (Marseilles), ballistas mounted on the wall hurled feathered javelins, twelve feet long, which crashed through the wattle-work and the planking of the sappers' huts. The descriptions of ballistic engines given by ancient writers have been elucidated by the co-operation of a German scholar and a German officer of artillery, who himself constructed models




#### SIEGE ARTILLERY AND AMMUNITION

The catapult was a two-armed torsion engine which hurled huge javelins and also stone balls. The specimens (right), ranging in weight from  $\frac{1}{2}$  lb. to 10 lb., were found in Scipio's encampments about Numantia. Above is a relief showing a front view of a catapult, protected by a shield with a hole for the missile. From Stuart-Jones, *'Companion to Roman History,'* Rice Holmes, *'The Roman Republic,'* and Schulten, *'Numantia'*

which had an effective range of about four hundred yards. The difference between catapults and ballistas is not precisely known; but both derived their power from the recoil of twisted cordage, and could discharge either javelins or stones. The illustration in this page depicting an engine of moderate calibre will show how they were worked: a catapult designed to throw heavy projectiles would of course have been more massive.

They bore some resemblance to huge crossbows; but instead of one bow there were



### CAMP OF THE MIDDLE REPUBLIC

The Roman camp was as nearly square as the nature of the ground permitted. The Praetorium, in which stood the commander's tent, occupied the centre. This early, ideal example is designed for two legions; later ones accommodated more.

*After Stuart-Jones, 'Companion to Roman History'*


two arms, passed through the skeins of cordage and connected by a rope, which formed the bow-string. A block, furnished with a hook which held the bow-string and was itself held down by a trigger, could slide backwards and forwards in a groove, which directed the flight of the missile. When the weapon was loaded the block was forced back by a windlass, despite the resisting cordage, and fixed by a catch, which fitted into a row of teeth. When the missile was to be discharged the trigger was pressed, the bow-string was released, the recoil of the cordage caused the arms to fly back, and the missile sped on its way.

Artillery was used not only in sieges but also in naval warfare, and occasionally in the field. Caesar, in order to prevent a Belgic host from outflanking his line of battle, dug trenches transversely on either side of a slope on which his legions were arrayed, and at the ends of each trench constructed redoubts, which he armed with artillery—probably light quick-firing weapons, of the kind which were called

'scorpions.' At a later time, during the great Gallic rebellion, one of his marshals, whom he left during his own enforced absence in charge of a portion of his army, was enabled by artillery to repel a desperate attack.

In terrestrial warfare, however, the principal use of artillery was in connexion with entrenchments; for Roman victories, especially those of Caesar and his adopted son, Octavian, were largely gained by the constant use of pick and shovel. As a general rule no Roman army halted for the night without constructing a camp fortified with trench, rampart and palisade. A camp intended to be occupied during a prolonged period or in the winter, when military operations were commonly suspended, was of course constructed with greater elaboration.

At the outset of his first Gallic campaign Caesar prevented the Helvetian invaders, whose intended settlement in Gaul he was determined to frustrate, from taking the direct route through the Roman province by throwing up earthworks along the Rhône, between the Lake of Geneva and the Pas de l'Ecluse, in the places where the banks were not so steep as to form a natural fortification. But the principal use of those entrenchments which did not belong to camps was in siege or blockade. When a siege was about to be undertaken,



### RECONSTRUCTION OF A PERMANENT FORT


This reconstruction of the Roman fort at Saalburg shows the lay-out of roads, gates and buildings within the walls and also the baths, temple and 'canabae' or settlements outside. It will be seen that it is planned on much the same lines as the temporary camp at the top of the page.

*From Jacot, 'Romarkastell, Saalburg'*

the fortress, unless marshes or other natural features made investment impossible, was enclosed by a contravallation, in order to ward off attack from without, to check sorties, or to prevent the introduction of supplies. The contravallation did not necessarily surround it; for sometimes a river or some other obstacle served in part the same purpose.

On two occasions in the later period of the Republic two encircling works were formed. When Caesar was blockading the hill-fort of Alesia, and when Octavian was besieging Perusia in northern Italy, a contravallation was erected to prevent the garrison from breaking out, and a circumvallation to prevent an army of relief from breaking in: in the former case subsidiary defences—abatis, sharp-pointed logs embedded in small pits, and barbed spikes—strengthened the earthworks, and in both wooden towers, carrying artil-

lery, were erected at short intervals on the ramparts. If the enemy had taken refuge on a high hill, such as Mont Auxois (the site of Alcsia) or the Puy d'Issolu (Uxellodunum) in the valley of the Dordogne, a siege, properly so called, was impossible, and he could only be forced to surrender by starvation, by defeating any army which might attempt to succour him, or, occasionally, by cutting off his supply of water. This last method was resorted to in the blockade of Uxellodunum, when a tunnel was driven into the hill-side to the source of a spring, from which alone the garrison, after they had been prevented



GRANARY IN ONE OF SCIPIO'S PERMANENT CAMPS IN SPAIN

The granary, which stood in an open space between the lines of the legion and those of the allies, its isolated position being a precaution against fire, was a stone building 110 feet long with buttressed walls, divided into three compartments. The raised floor secured it from damp. Large doors at one end opened on to a platform where wagons were loaded and unloaded. The reconstruction above affords a trustworthy picture of its original appearance.

From Adolf Schullen, 'Numantia,' Bruckmann A.G.

from approaching the river that bathed the foot of the hill, could obtain water, and the sappers diverted its flow.

If the fortress stood on low ground or on an elevated site which the assailants could safely approach, their methods varied according to the strength of the position. The earthwork near Canterbury which is now called Bigbury Camp was captured by troops who advanced in close order with shields locked over their heads, while others, moving between the files, shot earth or fascines into the ditch so as to form a causeway flush with the top of the rampart. Vellaunodunum, which may be identified with Montargis, between Sens and Orléans, surrendered after a blockade of three days. The Thessalian town, Gomphi (Palaea Episcopi), was taken by escalade before the battle of Pharsalus in a single day. But a fortress which deserved the name could offer a much longer resistance; and Massilia, fortified on modernised principles and provided with powerful artillery, required extraordinary means of attack.

The regular method of preparing the way for assault, practised not only by the Romans but also by Greeks and Asiatics, was to construct a terrace at right angles to that face of the fortress which could be most conveniently approached. As soon as it was finished a battering ram was brought into action; or if, as was usual among the Gauls, the wall, compacted with transverse balks and longitudinal beams of timber, was too tough to be breached, and rendered proof against fire by layers of stone and rubble, the assault was delivered by escalade. Before the construction of the terrace could begin it was generally necessary to level the ground, in order that the structure, which would be largely composed of timber, might stand firm. This preliminary operation was performed, if the garrison had no ballistic weapons except bows and slings, by men working inside stout movable huts; but when the fortress was provided with artillery, a more elaborate screen was required. In the siege of Massilia a single hut, corresponding exactly with the intended width of the terrace, built of timbers so strong that no projectiles could shatter them, furnished with a sloping roof, so that

stones discharged from ballistas might tumble off, and covered with fire-proof materials, was placed parallel with the wall. After the ground had been levelled the materials of which the terrace was to be constructed were carried by workers through a gallery formed of sheds open at both ends. In the siege of Massilia each shed was covered, to protect it from artillery, with four layers of fascines; but as these failed to resist the ballistas, the Romans were obliged to procure balks a foot thick as an additional protection.

The dimensions of the terrace varied according to the purpose which it was designed to serve. If the object was to breach the wall, the structure was comparatively narrow, sixty feet being found sufficient at Massilia. If, as in the siege of the Gallic stronghold of Avaricum (Bourges), the wall was proof against the battering-ram, and it became necessary to take the town by escalade, the terrace was made wide enough to accommodate the storming party. In both cases, however, the method of construction was the same. The builders, protected by movable wooden shields and supported by artillerymen, who kept their pieces playing upon the defenders, laid rows of logs in close contact upon the ground, similar rows above them crosswise, and so on



COVER FOR AN ASSAULT

The term 'testudo' (tortoise), which denoted a certain kind of sappers' hut, was also applied to the cover formed by uplifted shields under which soldiers occasionally advanced to storm a position; as here seen on Trajan's Column.

From *Cicliorix*, 'Die Traianussäule'

till the required height was reached, giving coherence to the structure by packing the interstices with earth and rubble. When the hinder parts were finished, a wooden tower, running upon rollers and furnished with storeys upon which catapults were mounted, was erected above. When the besieged were provided with powerful artillery the Roman artillerymen were screened by hempen mats, which no missiles could pierce;

**Resourcefulness of** and as soon as the  
**Roman Engineers** terrace was completed the battering ram was swung through the open framework of the tower by a crew working in a sappers' hut behind. When, as in the siege of Avaricum, it was necessary to give a wide extension to the terrace, the flanking parts served as viaducts, to carry the towers; the platform intended for the columns of assault, which at Avaricum were apparently concealed within and behind the sheds that stood upon it, probably occupied the front portion only of the intermediate space. To build a terrace right up to the wall was very difficult, and could only be done by a makeshift. As it was impossible to make the last section compact, huts of extraordinary strength were placed on the terrace near its edge, and, screened by them, the men shot earth, timber and fascines into the vacant space.

The terrace was liable to be undermined by a resourceful enemy, who might burn or drag away the lower timbers; and at Massilia, where two terraces were necessary, the destruction of one of them, which was set ablaze by the defenders during an informal armistice, compelled the Roman engineers to construct another of the same dimensions, but of a kind which appears to have been unique—a pair of parallel brick walls, forty-eight feet apart and each six feet thick, roofed with the timber that had escaped destruction, upon which were laid fascines, covered with earth, to form a level roadway.

But Roman engineers had other means of attack. At Avaricum, in the hope of dislodging the stones in the wall, the woodwork of which rendered it proof against the ram, they used powerful hooks, riveted to stout poles, which, however, the defenders seized with nooses and hauled up

by means of windlasses. Trebonius, in the siege of Massilia, resorted to mines, which the garrison rendered useless by digging a deep ditch behind. The ingenuity of his chief engineer, however, was equal to any trial. As the besiegers were harassed by frequent sorties, he contrived to erect close to the wall a brick tower, six storeys high, on each of which catapults were mounted, and by discharging missiles through loopholes rendered the whole area within range safe from attack. As soon as the tower was completed the besiegers were enabled to prepare a device for destroying one of the massive bastions and thus supporting the attack that was to be directed from the terrace. A sappers' hut, sixty feet long, four feet wide inside, and high enough to allow men to stand upright within, was covered by materials proof against fire and water, and moved on rollers until it lay with its whole length in contact with the masonry. Huge stones were pitched from the wall on to the roof, but the timbers withstood the crash, and while missiles were showered from the brick tower against the defenders, the men inside the hut prized out the foundation stones.

Naval power, if it was rarely decisive, played its part in the development of Roman dominion; and the Romans made naval battles approximate in character to battles upon land. When their fleets were not commanded by Greek mariners, the admirals were military men. Battles with the Carthaginians were won, despite **Land tactics in sea fights** the nautical inexperience of the Romans, by a device

familiar to schoolboys—a gangway which, lowered on to an enemy's ship, fixed itself by an iron spike in the deck and enabled the legionaries to board it. When Caesar had to contend off the coast of Brittany against the powerful fleet of the Veneti, his lieutenant, Decimus Brutus, foreseeing that it would be useless to attempt to ram the enemy's massive ships, used an instrument contrived by his engineers. With sharp, sickle-shaped hooks fixed to poles the legionaries who manned his galleys seized the halcyards; the rowers plied their oars; the sudden strain snapped the ropes; and as the yards and sails fell down, the legionaries, clambering aboard the help-

less hulk, ended the struggle with their swords. A few years later, in the Mediterranean, Decimus was opposed to the Greeks of Massilia, whose vessels, like his own, when they were cleared for action, were propelled only by oars. Their galleys were faster, their skippers and oarsmen more skilful than his; but though they endeavoured to envelop his fleet and then to ram his vessels or to smash their oars, he won the battle with the aid of grappling irons, which enabled his fighting men to seize and board the hostile craft.

Agrippa devised an improved grappling iron, by means of which he gained a decisive victory over the famous corsair, Sextus Pompeius. His object was to enable the instrument to be launched safely from a distance and to make it impossible for the enemy to break the pole to which the grappling hook was attached. This was done by casing the pole with iron and attaching to its lower end a ring, through which were passed ropes controlled by a windlass. It was discharged by a catapult, and when it caught hold, the ropes were pulled taut.

Agrippa was not only an inventor and a skilful admiral, but also a naval architect. He had built large vessels to overpower

those of Sextus; but when his chief was about to encounter Antony, who had hastily followed

his example, he prepared light galleys, which, being handled easily and extraordinarily swift, could attack the enemy's cumbrous ships, which they outnumbered, whenever an opening presented itself, or move rapidly out of danger if they were threatened with the ram. When artillery was used in naval warfare, the engines were mounted on wooden turrets, which could be erected or lowered at will.

It sometimes happened that, from want of transport or other causes, supplies were difficult to obtain, and numerous passages in Caesar's Commentaries show the care which he devoted to his commissariat. In Gaul he succeeded so well by ensuring regular deliveries of corn from friendly or subjugated tribes that while his enemies were obliged to strike prematurely or to disperse because they had neglected to secure their means of subsistence, he was

able to keep his forces together and to choose his own time; but, during the operations which he conducted against Pompey near Dyrrachium (Durazzo), he was unable for want of shipping to procure grain from Italy, and though he made requisitions from neighbouring tribes, he could obtain so little wheat that his troops were obliged to live on barley, pulse, roots and meat, which in normal circumstances they rarely ate. In the Republican period wealthy officers had often been attended by their private surgeons, and medical aid of some sort provided for the rank and file; but under the Empire a permanent medical staff was maintained.


A well-authenticated incident shows the devotion of which Roman soldiers were capable, even after they had begun to serve not from patriotism, but for the rewards which their commander could offer. When Caesar was campaigning in Africa against Scipio, the father-in-law of Pompey, one of his centurions was captured with the privates of whom he was in charge and sent to the camp of Scipio, who told them that if they would take service with him, he would not only pardon, but also reward them. The centurion replied:

*Devoted loyalty of Roman soldiery*

I thank you, Scipio—I will not call you Emperor—for your great kindness in offering life and immunity to a prisoner of war, and perhaps I might avail myself of it if it were not associated with the lowest depth of villainy. I to bear arms against my general, Caesar, under whom I have commanded a company, and against his army, for whose honour I have fought victoriously thirty-six times or more! No! That I will never do, and seriously I counsel you to desist from your enterprise; for if you have not yet realized the character of the man whose force you have to encounter, you may learn it now. Choose one of your cohorts—the one you deem the bravest—and array it against me, while I take just ten of my comrades, now in your power. Then shall you learn from our valour what you may expect from your own men.

Trembling with rage, Scipio signed to his attendant officers, and while he looked on the centurion was killed. But his example remained. Not statesmanship nor generalship alone, but also character made Rome supreme.





#### FORM OF TEMPLE DERIVED FROM ANCIENT ITALIAN HOMESTEADS

Since family worship centred in Vesta, the hearth-spirit, her House at Rome was appropriately given the circular shape of an early Latin farmhouse. The foundations alone survive, but here we see another Roman temple, built on the same plan and also an ancient foundation whose essential features are preserved. It was probably dedicated to the Mater Matuta, goddess of the dawn. Now the church of S. Maria del Sole it stands on the Tiber bank where was once the Forum Boarium.

*Photo Donald McLeish*

# THE RELIGION OF THE LATINS

How the Spirits of the Latin Farm  
became the Gods of the Roman State

By CYRIL BAILEY

Jowett Fellow of Balliol College and University Lecturer in Greek and Latin Literature,  
Oxford; Author of *The Religion of Ancient Rome*, etc.

A READER of the stories told in Vergil or Ovid or other Latin poets would naturally suppose that the religion of the Romans was an anthropomorphic religion like that of the Greeks. He meets the same kind of human deities, who marry and are given in marriage, have hates and loves, activities and adventures; but they seem a little less alive, and are disguised under new names, which occasionally recall their Greek originals but more often seem to have nothing to do with them. And if he has also read something of the historians and orators, he will have learnt that there was a state religion, a cult of these same deities, with an elaborate organization of ceremonies and sacrifices, 'flamens' and 'pontiffs,' auguries and omens, the observance of which was a great anxiety and often a hindrance to the Roman magistrates.

The picture in his mind will not be far from the truth as far as concerns the period with which we are here principally concerned, but it is very remote from the genuine religion of the Latins, and if that which was the foundation on which these later developments were built is to be rightly understood, it is necessary to dig deep into past history and even to penetrate beyond the foundation of Rome itself into the thoughts and practices of the early inhabitants of Latium. The materials for such an investigation are few and scattered, but they have been pieced together into an intelligible picture by modern scholars with accuracy and imagination.

The early inhabitants of Latium—whatever their racial origin—were already a civilized people, living a settled agricultural life in the plain which is bounded on the west by the sea and on the other sides


by the hills and mountains on which Rome looks out to-day. The soil was meagre and agriculture was a hard task, but they were a vigorous, energetic people and they pastured cattle, sheep, goats and pigs, raised crops and cultivated the vine. They did not at first inhabit village communities, but lived in detached farms, each belonging to a family living under the rule of its 'paterfamilias' or head. Though the soil was difficult, the climate was on the whole dependable and the seasons of the various agricultural operations could thus be approximately fixed.

Though here and there among their beliefs may be found traces of earlier magical ideas, the Latins were in the more advanced stage of religion to which modern anthropologists have given the name of animism.

They were conscious of powers greater than themselves, but they did not, like some other early peoples, identify them with the forces of nature. There is no trace in the genuine Latin religion of the worship of sun and moon, of winds or sea, and it is significant that Jupiter the sky god, who later attained to an ideal supremacy, had as his main province in the early stage the care of the vine.

Rather the Latins recognized a multitude of smaller spirits dwelling in and controlling the individual objects and places with which they were familiar in their daily life. Thus in the house the door (Janus) and the hearth (Vesta) were the abode of such spirits; in the fields they were associated with the agricultural operations of the year, and in uncultivated surroundings they were felt to be present in streams and springs, in groves and on hill-tops. These spirits were not conceived, like

Belief in transcend-  
ent powers



**VESTA'S TEMPLE IN MINIATURE**

Fractured in the Forum at Rome, the House of Vesta was a focus of national worship since it contained the hearth of the State. This model is from a bas-relief of the second century A.D.

*Uffizi, Florence - photo, Droga*

the gods of the Greeks, in human form, but in a vaguer and more truly religious way. the typical word by which they are described is not 'deus,' a god—though that, too, occurs very early—but rather 'numen,' a 'power' or spirit.

Usually the Latins gave names to the spirits, sometimes, as to Fons (a spring), just the name of the natural object itself; sometimes, as to Consus or Ops, the spirits of the stored harvest, names derived from an agricultural function. But often they seemed to feel the spirit so indeterminate that they could not even name it, 'be you male or female, god or goddess,' is a formula which frequently recurs in the old recorded prayers.

Spirits then, vaguely felt and associated with functions or localities or both, were the objects of the old worship of the Latins, and the word which most characteristically describes their attitude towards these spirits is 'religio.' Over this word—itsself one of the greatest bequests of Rome to the modern world—great battles have been fought among scholars. Its derivation is much disputed, its meaning has been variously interpreted. The truth probably is that for the Romans themselves its

significance changed, and that as their cult became stereotyped in the state worship, it came to denote more and more a legal relation between gods and men which could be summed up in something like a code of sacred law. But in the earliest stage it was just the natural feeling which man experienced when he felt himself in the presence of a 'spirit'; the single English word which most nearly expresses it is 'awe' or, as Warde Fowler preferred to call it, 'anxiety.' Thus Ovid, who for all his Greek sophistication often preserves a touch of the true Latin spirit, speaks of a grove on the Aventine as a place where, when you saw it, you would naturally exclaim 'there is a spirit here.' It is no doubt primarily a feeling of fear; you do not quite trust yourself to enter that grove, for fear that the spirit may harm you. But it has also from the first the kindred feeling of reverence, a sense of some greater power before which you must abase yourself. The germ of all true religion is in it, and it is the key to the understanding of the religion of the Latins.

With this general notion of 'numen' and 'religio' in mind, we may try to enter a little more closely into the religious life of these Latin farmers. The 'family,' which besides the paterfamilias and his direct descendants, with Religion of their wives and children, in the family included the farm-workers, slave and free, was settled on its own farm or estate, separated from those of other families by boundary marks. The house, as can be seen from the little models found in early tombs in the Forum, was round in shape, a development, probably, of a primitive wigwam; the form was preserved in the round House of Vesta at Rome and may be seen to-day in the beautiful temple on the Tiber bank, which is most probably assigned to the dawn goddess (Matuta). There was one door to the hut, and in the middle of the round interior was the hearth, in front of which was set the table for the family meals; at the back against the wall was the cupboard in which the food was stored.

Here are the main centres of family worship. The door (janua) was at once the 'safety-valve' of the house through

which influences within might be driven out, and the danger point by which evil from without might enter: it appears in both capacities in connexion with the normal crises of family life, birth, marriage and death. Hence Janus, the two-faced door spirit, becomes an object of awe, though oddly enough more is known of his cult at the gateway of the state than in the worship of the household.

A clearer figure is the hearth spirit (Vesta), on whom the warmth and the food of the family depend. In all the long history of Roman religion Vesta retains her character as a numen: no image of her was ever made and no anthropomorphic legends were told of her; Ovid in another of his luminous touches tells us that she is 'none other than the living flame.' Every day at the household meal a pause was made after the main course and a portion of salted cake, baked by the daughters of the house, was thrown from a ritual plate




#### TWO-FACED GOD OF DOORWAYS

Janus was worshipped in Rome as the guardian of doors and gateways. Since he was believed to watch over comings-in and goings-out, he was personified with two faces, as on this bronze coin (c. 240 B.C.); sometimes even with four.

*British Museum*

into the fire on the hearth as an offering to Vesta and the other household spirits. Later, when conceptions had become anthropomorphic, little images of the other gods of the family, such as may be seen in their small shrines in Pompeian houses, were placed on the table, but never one of Vesta: she was the hearth itself which



#### PRIVATE SHRINES AT WHICH THE HOUSEHOLD GODS WERE WORSHIPPED

The family was an important unit in the Roman State, each having its particular deities—its Lar and Penates. The Lar of the household was regarded as its protector; the Penates were originally guardians of the store-room, later a group of the higher gods to whom special reverence was paid. In every house their shrine occupied an honoured place; of these two, found at Pompeii, one still contains images of two Laras and the other household gods.

*Left, from H. Stuart-Jones, 'Companion to Roman History'; right, photo. Geo. Long*

received the offering. Janus and Vesta, then, are the two named deities in the house, and it is significant of their importance that it became a ritual rule in every prayer in which an appeal was made to many gods to begin the list with the name of Janus and end with that of Vesta.

After door and hearth the most essential feature of the house was the store-cupboard in which the produce of the fields was kept. This was presided over not by a single named spirit, but by a group undefined in number and names. Later on they would be identified with known deities, and in Pompeian shrines we find them represented by groups of gods, varying in different households and chosen, it would seem, much as an Italian household might now choose its patron saints. But originally the 'spirits of the store' (Penates) were nameless, yet none the less potent for that. They had their

place in the acts of family worship and, as we know from the Roman poets, the Penates came to stand for the Roman as a peculiar symbol of his home.

Associated with them in the poets we often find the Lares, the plural is of late date, but the 'Lar of the household' certainly goes back to a very early stage. Who he was is a matter of dispute, and some scholars would like to see in him the dead ancestor of the family, revered with the other household gods. But it is very doubtful whether ancestor worship was known in the old Roman religion, and it is most likely that the Lar is really a field spirit, worshipped particularly by the farm hands under the charge of the bailiff, and brought into the house by them as their special protector. Later, the master and his family linked his cult with that of the other household spirits, and so Lares and Penates became the Roman equivalent of 'hearth and home'.

A harder conception for us moderns to understand is that of the Genius, which

was specially associated with the paterfamilias. Originally he was, as his name shows—it is connected with the Latin word 'gignere,' to procreate—the reproductive power of the head of the house, which ensures the continuity of the family.

As such he is specially associated with the marriage-bed. But he takes on a wider character as representing all the virile powers of the master of the house and in a sense personifying his authority; thus in late representations he is often depicted with the features of the paterfamilias, who, conversely, is shown in ritual scenes with the attributes of the Genius. Later conceptions made him a kind of twin-soul of his owner, and, after association with the Greek daemon, almost a guardian angel.

Every male had his own Genius, as every woman had her Juno, but it was the Genius of the master which was the centre of the house-

cult. Nor is this unnatural, for the family and not the individual was the unit in the community. On the death of the master it would break up and each of the sons would become the paterfamilias of a new familia worshipping a new Genius. The idea of the Genius was developed in many directions, the most interesting being the cult of the Genius of the Emperor, one of the many converging influences which made for Caesar worship. In its simpler form it remains a summing up of the associations of home.

Janus, Vesta, the Penates, the Lar of the household and the Genius were thus the spirits with which the religion of the home was concerned. In a pious household they were worshipped daily in the early morning and at meals; and special offerings would be made to them on great occasions in family life, such as a birth, an arrival or a departure, and on the master's birthday. The head of the house was himself the family priest and



#### FAMILY GOD

The household Lar was usually represented in sculpture as a dancing youth bearing a bowl and a horn of plenty

*British Museum*

conducted all worship, but in his absence the bailiff might officiate, as he always could with his wife in the cult of the Lar, the special deity of the farm hands. The paterfamilias would be assisted by his sons acting as acolytes and, if victims were to be sacrificed, the butcher-priest would be called in and possibly a flute-player to drown any irrelevant or unfavourable noises.

Before leaving the household a word must be added about the ceremonies connected with the great family events

of birth, marriage and death. These are for the most part very primitive in character, and are concerned more with the aversion of possible evil influences than with any prayer to benignant spirits for blessings. Immediately after birth a sacrifice was made to two obscure spirits, Picumpus and Pilumnus, and at night three men came to the threshold armed with an axe, a stake and a broom. Their function, Varro tells us, was to keep off the attacks of Silvanus, the wild spirit of the woods; but we may safely look back



#### OFFERINGS ACCEPTABLE TO THE GODS OF THE LATIN

The sacrifice of animals was an important element in most Roman religious festivals. In family worship the father or his deputies performed the ceremonies; in public celebrations priests and magistrates officiated. Above we see ministrants leading a boar and bull to the sacrifice, and another dragging a goat—an unexpected feature, since by tradition the animals must go willingly. The girdle seen on the boar is the sacred 'infula' of white wool with which consecrated beasts were adorned.


*British Museum (top left), Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen (top right), and Boston Museum of Fine Arts.*

to a still earlier period when their intention was to slay the evil spirits who might wish to enter, and to sweep out those who had gathered within at the event of child-birth, always thought by primitive peoples to involve impurity. Here the importance of the door comes into prominence and it is characteristically recorded that the ceremony was presided over by three functional spirits, *Inter-cidona* ('the hacker'), *Pilumnus* ('the stake-spirit') and *Deverra* ('the sweeper').

Marriage at Rome was in some of its forms a merely civil ceremony, but its most solemn celebration, '*confarreatio*,'

connexion with the household cults. The bride was lifted over the threshold of the door to avoid any possibility of a stumble, and she brought with her three coins, one to give to her husband, one to offer to the *Lar* in the house, the third to offer to the *Lares* in the fields at the boundary of the property. The marriage ceremonies are on the whole less primitive than those connected with birth.

Such rites as are associated with death seem all directed not to honour the dead but to protect the living from evil influences. At the moment of death there was no ritual nor was the funeral itself



#### LATIN FAMILY CULT PERPETUATED ON FOREIGN SOIL

The family cults of Latium receive illustration from a strange quarter—the island of Delos, where excavations have revealed almost a miniature Pompeii. This is the decoration on an altar, and the togas of the worshipping family and their covered heads show that they are Romans, not Greeks as one might have expected. The subject is the sacrifice of a pig to the '*Genius*' of the household; the attendant leads the victim to the altar while the '*paterfamilias*' pours a libation from a '*patera*.'

*From 'Monuments et Mémoires Piot'*

was always religious and was in later times consecrated by the presence of the Pontifex Maximus, the principal administrator of ecclesiastical law, and the Flamen Dialis, the most important of the sacrificial priests. Its chief ceremony was an act at once of sacrifice and of communion. Bride and bridegroom sat on chairs placed side by side and covered with a lambskin, they offered bloodless offerings of corn and salted meal to Jupiter, and themselves ate the sacred cake made of spelt ('*libus farreus*'), from which the ceremony took its name. The bringing of the bride to her new home was accompanied by many rites, mostly superstitious, which readers of the Latin poets will remember from Catullus' beautiful wedding hymn, but there was a close

religious, but merely a procession to the tomb in which the dead was laid. But when the family returned home they first purified the house by the sacrifice of a sow to Ceres, one of the earth spirits, and by the sweeping out of the house—note the parallel to the ritual at birth—and then purified themselves by fire and water. After that they sat down to a funeral feast, which Cicero specially tells us was in honour of the living and not of the dead. The dead were not worshipped but they were not forgotten. On the anniversaries of the death and the funeral the family visited the grave and made simple offerings of salt cake and garlands of flowers.

Twice in the yearly calendar occur ceremonials connected with the dead,


very different in character, and significant of two stages of thought with regard to them. At the Lemuria in May the dead—spoken of as the Lemures or Larvae, both ill-omened names—are conceived of as possibly hostile spirits who must be exorcised. The paterfamilias rises at midnight, walks barefoot through the house, spitting black beans from his mouth and exclaiming, 'With these I redeem me and mine'; he washes and clanks brazen vessels together and cries out, 'Depart, spirits of our fathers.' Here is 'religio' founded upon fear, and it is not surprising to be told by Ovid that the Lemuria was the older festival of the two connected with the dead. In February occurred the 'festival of the ancestors' (Parmentalia), when the dead were regarded with affection as in some sense still members of the household. Offerings were made at the tombs for some days, at the end of which the family gathered in a kind of 'love feast,' which culminated in the worship of the Lar of the household. Here is seen again the true spirit of the household cult.

It has been of value to give this somewhat detailed account of the worship of the home, because it is indeed the living core of the old Latin religion. It was in the house that it had its spring, and thence it extended into the fields and, later, into the state. This cult of the house spirits, uniting the members of the household,

free and slave, living and dead, is again the root of another of Rome's great words, 'pietas,' which always has the double idea of devotion to the gods and affection for the family; so we see it in Vergil's 'pious Aeneas,' the typically 'pious' hero of poetry.

The worship of the household was always the most vital part of the Roman religion, and lasted on not only in the country farms, but in the town houses as well, especially among the poorer classes. It had in it the making of true religion, but it is typical of Roman conservatism that it never developed further.

It is time to pass from the house into the fields and to see what part religion played in the outdoor life of the Latin farmer; it will be found that the same general ideas prevail and that religion is again both local and functional. The local focus of religious ceremonies is the boundary of the property, and we have record of three interesting celebrations which exhibit different aspects of the religious outlook. On February 23 each year, in the month when there was but little agricultural work to be done, a solemn ceremony took place at the actual boundary-marks ('termini')—stones or stocks of wood driven deep into the ground. It was performed jointly by the owners of property on either side and was, we may feel sure, a renewal of the



POMP AND DIGNITY OF A WEALTHY ROMAN'S LAST JOURNEY

The inevitable element in Roman funerals was the procession to the grave—not itself a religious ceremony, although it had ritual significance. The usual attendants upon the dead on this occasion are included in the above relief (first century A.D.). Eight men, relatives or liberated slaves, bear the gorgeous litter in which the body is disposed as if alive. Before it walk the mutes, and musicians playing upon flutes, trumpets and horns; behind come mourners and spectators.

*Aquila Museum, from Rostovtzeff, 'Rome,' Clarendon Press*



original religious compact between them. Ovid has left us an attractive description of these rustic rites. The two owners set garlands each on his own side of the stone and bring offerings of cakes. An altar is raised, to which the farmer's wife fetches fire from the farm hearth; the farmer

himself chops up sticks, drives them into the ground and lights a fire with bark.

**Offerings to Rustic Spirits**  
The son holds a basket from which the daughter thrice throws on to the fire the fruits of the earth and honeyed cakes. Others stand by with wine. A lamb is then slain, together with a sucking-pig, and the stone sprinkled with their blood, after which all join in a feast and prayer to 'Terminus.' The object of worship here is clearly the spirit within the boundary-stone who consecrates the boundary—perhaps in an earlier period the stone itself. Ovid expresses this well: 'Terminus, be thou stone or stake driven deep in the field, thou too from of old hast a spirit.'

Akin to this is the festival which took place in January at the 'compitum,' the place where several properties marched, or cross-paths met. Here the members of all the households concerned united to worship the Lares Compitales. Not much is known of the ceremony, but there is

reason to suppose that each household erected an altar on its own property and sacrificed to the Lar of its own fields. On this occasion there was a holiday for all the slaves.

But the boundary was looked upon by the Latin farmer not merely as a division between his own property and his neighbour's, but also as enclosing his own lands, and towards the end of May, a month of great importance for the growth both of crops and the young of the flocks and herds, he performed the Ambarvalia, a solemn lustration of the fields for the aversion of evil. The little procession passed round the boundaries and an offering was made not only of the remains of last year's harvest and the first-fruits of the new crops, but of the most complete animal sacrifice which the farmer could offer, the 'suovetaurilia,' the pig, the sheep and the ox. The deity concerned was Mars, who appears here in an unmistakably agricultural character. Cato has preserved the farmer's prayer:

Father Mars, I pray and beseech thee that thou mayest be gracious and favourable to me, to my home and my household, for which cause I have ordained that the offering of pig, sheep and ox be carried round my fields, my land and my farm; that thou mayest avert, ward off and keep afar all disease, visible and invisible, all barrenness,



RITE PERFORMED AT A GREAT AGRICULTURAL FESTIVAL

At the Ambarvalia in May the Latin farmer made his greatest sacrifice for the aversion of evil from his lands to Mars, worshipped in this connexion as an agricultural god. This offering was the 'suovetaurilia,' consisting of a pig, sheep and ox. Before being slaughtered the victims were conducted round the boundaries of the farm by a procession composed of the head of the household, his family and servants. As seen above, libations were made to earth deities during their progress.

Louvre; photo, Archives Photographiques

waste, misfortune and ill weather; that thou mayest suffer our crops, our corn, our vines and bushes to grow and come to prosperity; that thou mayest preserve the shepherds and the flocks in safety and grant health and strength to me, to my home and to my household.

Specially characteristic of the Latin mind is the careful precision of details, the repetitions and the use of synonyms; nothing must be omitted, no loophole left for misapprehension by the god; for if man performs his part duly, the god is bound to hear and answer.

These rites at the boundaries were, however, but a small part of the Latin farmer's religious practice. Throughout the year there was a series of functional festivals connected with the operations in the field, each of which must be duly observed. We know of these festivals by the fortunate preservation of several of the old religious calendars. These were no doubt drawn up in the period of the state worship, and show a degree of organization and regulation which can

**Feast Days in  
the farmer's year**

hardly have been known to the early farmers; they assign its religious character, sacred or profane, to each day in the year, and distinguish the 'red-letter' festivals of the old agricultural year from those of later origin, such as the dedication days of temples. But there can be no doubt that they do in fact represent the old practice and that these red-letter festivals were observed on the primitive farms of Latium. The festivals fall naturally into three groups, those of spring, of the summer harvest and of winter.

The spring festivals are naturally concerned with the farmer's fears and hopes for the young crops and cattle. In March is found a series of ceremonies connected with Mars and his 'leaping' priests (Salii). These, as we know them in the state cult, are mainly military in character, but there are traces even there that Mars was at first not merely the war god, the protector of the young men, but also the protector of the young crops and herds.

The most important of April festivals was the Parilia of the 21st, addressed to the old rustic spirit, Pales, for which Ovid

has given minute directions. The flocks were to be purified at early dawn with the sprinkling of water, and the folds adorned with leaves, branches and wreaths. Then sulphur must be burned and the sheep touched with it, and a fire made of olive, pine, juniper and laurel. Millet and milk are next to be offered to Pales and prayer made to her for the forgiveness of unwitting trespasses, for the aversion of disease and the prosperity of crops and herds. Milk and wine and must may then be drunk and the worshippers leap through the blazing flames, even driving their flocks through the fire before them. Here is the double idea of purification of men and beasts and prayer to the rustic goddess. In May came the Ambarvalia, already noticed, while in June and July, when the farmer was waiting for the completion of the harvest, there are no great agricultural festivals.

**Rites to secure  
good crops**

The late summer and autumn festivals are of the nature of 'harvest-home.' They open with two ceremonies of storing the harvest, the Consualia, on August 21, in honour of the spirit Consus (from 'condere,' to store) and the Opiconsivia on the 25th in honour of Ops, the spirit of wealth so stored. These two were probably an old 'deity pair' such as are often found in the early religion. Our accounts of the festivals refer only to the state ceremonies, but it may be inferred that at the rustic festivals the crops were stored in an underground chamber, while the beasts who had helped to bring in the harvest were set free for the day and garlanded with flowers.

On October 11 comes the vintage harvest, at which the new must and last year's wine were solemnly drunk to the formula: 'I drink the new wine and the old wine; with new wine and old I heal disease.' From this formula was evolved the numen Meditrina ('the healer'), and from her the title of the festival Meditrinalia; but there need hardly be a doubt that as a vintage ceremony this must originally have been held in honour of Jupiter. To these harvest festivals we may add the Fontinalia of October 13, a picturesque occasion on which wells ('fontes')



OUR LADY OF THE ORCHARDS

Pomona, goddess of the fruit of trees, was among the more important of the rustic divinities worshipped by the ancient Italian farmers. This lovely and characteristic image suggests the essential simplicity and gaiety of her cult.

Uffizi Gallery, Florence; photo, Alinari

were garlanded and flowers slung into the water. The constant recurrence of flowers and garlands in these rustic festivals is a pleasant touch and suggests the farmer's simple delight in the countryside.

The winter festivals cannot be so easily grouped together and some of them were hardly agricultural in character. The Saturnalia in December must originally have been a sowing feast in honour of Saturnus (derived from 'serere,' to sow), but it was so altered in its urban form and overlaid with Greek elements that all trace of its rustic character has been lost. December, too, saw the strange repetition of the ceremonies dedicated to Consus and Ops, possibly, as has been suggested,

on the occasion of an opening of the underground chambers to ensure that the harvest was not rotting. In February occurred the mysterious ceremony, the Lupercalia, which has been made familiar to us from the use made of it in 44 B.C. by Mark Antony, when, acting as a 'lupercus,' he took occasion to offer the crown to Caesar. It was probably a complex rite, most likely held in honour of the rustic deity Faunus, and in so far as it had an agricultural significance it was associated with fertility.

And so the year came round again to March. We are left with the impression that the conscientious Latin farmer had much ritual to perform in the twelve months. In not a little of it there survives the element of fear in 'religio,' and ceremonies take the form of aversion of possible dangers. But, on the other hand, there is a considerable sense of kindness on the part of the spirits concerned and an assumption that they will be willing to hear prayer and grant favours. Nor can anyone fail to notice the large element of good-natured happiness and enjoyment in the 'feasts and jollity' which



IDYLIC GOD OF THE FIELDS

Saturn at first was especially connected with agriculture, in particular with sowing and the harvest. He was later identified with the Greek god Cronus, and was believed to have reigned on earth during the Golden Age.

British Museum; photo, Mansell

accompanied the rites, and a very humane desire that the beasts too should have their share of festivity. The old ritual as part of the genuine agricultural life of the Latins may have been exacting, but it was neither burdensome nor meaningless.

An attempt has been made to show the place occupied by religion in the life of the early Latin farmer and to depict its character. It is primitive and naïve, no doubt, but genuine. There are traces in it of superstition and its roots often lie far back in fear. But there is also a simple 'piety' which pervades the life both at home and in the fields, which seems to touch morality both in inculcating kindly relations between members of the household and in instilling a sense of good faith between neighbours. And if at times its ritual, especially in the agricultural festivals, has a touch of formalism, it is not surprising that so prominent a characteristic of the Roman should have its antecedent in his Latin ancestors.

It is now necessary to consider some of the developments and changes which came over this early religion. There grew up, by what steps we cannot tell, side by side with the farming communities, villages and even towns in which life was no longer purely agricultural.

Legend assigns the first predominance among the townships to Alba Longa, which lay on the hill above the lake of Nemi. On that hill the representatives of the Latin towns met year by year to celebrate the religious side of their union in an act of communion with one another and their common god Jupiter Latiaris. The victim was slain and offered and the sacrificed flesh partaken of by the worshippers.

Long after Alba had fallen this yearly rite was celebrated, and in the great days of Rome's supremacy it was one of the first duties of the Consul to go to the Alban mount and perform the rites of the Latin festival. The old religious bond of the Latins was still honoured even when, as Cicero tells us, some of the constituent



#### DIVINE PATRONS OF ROME

Etruscan influences were responsible for the association of Juno and Minerva with Jupiter as the state gods of Rome and later of the Empire—the triad represented on this Gallic relief. In most Roman towns they had their 'Capitolium,' in imitation of the temple on the Capitol.

Musée St. Germain, courtesy of M. Salomon, Rouen

townships had so fallen into decay that it was hard to find a representative to go to Alba to fetch the portion of sacrificial flesh.

But Alba fell and Rome, not without a struggle, became the dominant power in Latium and developed into a 'city state.' Henceforth in the study of religion we have to think not of the Latin farmer, but of the Roman citizen, or, rather, of the Roman state. Here we can only attempt to give some idea of the state cult as it was in the earlier days of the Republic.

It must not be forgotten that the state cult itself was a gradual development; three main periods may be distinguished which correspond exactly to the political history of Rome. In the earliest period we see Rome as an amalgamation of two townships or settlements on the Palatine and Quirinal hills; between them lies the Forum, their place of meeting for civil business, and at its head is the Capitoline hill, the place of common worship. On that hill was consecrated the cult of a triad of deities significant of the union: Jupiter Optimus Maximus, 'the greatest and best' of all the many Jupiters known by local and functional cult titles, worshipped in common by both communities; Mars, now the war god of the

Palatine settlement, and Quirinus, the corresponding deity of the Quirinal. As legend assigned the political foundation of Rome to the first king Romulus, so its religious organization is attributed to the second king Numa, the 'religion of Numa' is spoken of with affection as the basis of the



whole state religion. The king, the *paterfamilias*, as it were of the state, is its religious as well as its civil head.

Secondly, historians recognize in Servius Tullius the founder of the Etruscan dynasty at Rome, and there can be no doubt that in the later regal period a profound Etruscan influence affected religion. Not merely did it introduce new deities, so that the Capitoline triad now becomes Jupiter, Juno and Minerva, but it changed the whole conception of the 'spirit'. As Servius built the walls of Rome, so the Etruscans, whose civilization was probably a delayed form of Hellenism, introduced to Rome the temple 'made with hands' as the dwelling place of the god instead of the open grove

or hill-top, and with the temple, or soon after it, the *sensuous* representation of the deity in bust or statue. This tended to crystallise the conception of a god and was a long step towards anthropomorphism, and so to the destruction of the older and really more religious notion of the spirits.

Finally, the expulsion of the kings and the establishment of the Republic meant the distribution of the religious offices of the king between the magistrates and the various priesthoods, which had already been constituted in the 'religion of Numa.' This was a change in organization rather than in substance.

Rome was not, of course, 'built in a day,' and the farmers must have found themselves almost imperceptibly becoming citizens with town occupations, yet keeping up the celebration of the rites which they or their fathers had performed naturally in the country. And though by the time of Numa's organization the city state must have been fully developed, yet provision was made for the fulfilment of all the rustic festivals, adapted as they best could be to the new conditions—there was always a strong element of



SIGN OF CHANGED RELIGIOUS IDEALS

The transference of public worship from woods and fields to temples represented one aspect of the fundamental transformation wrought in Roman religion by Hellenic conceptions. Above is the temple (presumably) of Fortuna at Rome as it now stands and imaginatively but accurately reconstructed.

From *Paolozzoff 'Rome'* courtesy of *Clarendon Press*

conservatism in the Roman mind, especially in religious matters. The process may perhaps best be understood by tracing in a few typical cases what happened to the rustic festivals and to the rustic deities after they had entered the city.

The history of the three boundary festivals is significant. The *Ambarvalia*, essentially a rustic ceremony, is yet performed in the city, and the solemn procession, with the *suovetaurilia*, passes round the boundaries of the state; but there are two notable changes. The rites are now performed on behalf of the

time Ceres, and later the *Dea Dia*, a vague and ancient earth spirit revived for this purpose. And side by side with this reproduction of the rustic rite was invented an *Amburbium*, a lustration of the city ('ubs') which was more appropriate to the new town life.

Terminus is now enshrined in the great temple of Jupiter on the Capitol, represented there by a sacred stone, immediately over which there is a hole in the roof, in order that the deity may be worshipped, as he should be, in the open air. Legend says that the stone was there before Jupiter, and that when the Capitoline temple was built Terminus



**GRAECO-ROMAN KING OF GODS**

The Jupiter worshipped by the early Latins was a patron of agriculture, a sky deity and bringer of fertility. But when he became a Roman state god he was identified with the Greek Zeus, as in this statue with its eagle-crowned sceptre.

*Vatican; photo, Mancini*

state by an organized priesthood, the Arval Brothers, whose ancient and barely intelligible ritual hymn still in part survives; and the deity associated with the ceremony is no longer Mars, who has become in the state the god of war, but in Vergil's



**ROMAN RELIGION HELLENISED**

Originally a Latin vegetation deity, Mars became god of war and was eventually given the attributes of the Greek Ares. This Roman image of him embodies no native conception, being executed in the manner of Lysippos of Sicyon.

*Rome, Museo delle Terme; photo, Anderson*



MEMBER OF A SACRED ORDER

In the temple of Vesta fire burnt continually throughout the year on the public hearth, which was tended by the Vestal virgins—an order of priestesses that dwelt apart from the world in a kind of nunnery.

Rome, National Museum; photo, Anderson

refused to budge, it is indeed possible that he represents the actual boundary stone between the Palatine and Quirinal settlements. At the same time we hear that public sacrifices were made annually to Terminus at the sixth milestone on the Via Laurentina, which looks like a reproduction of the Terminalia at what was at some period the state boundary. Similarly the Compitalia are celebrated in the city at the points where the cross-streets meet, two small shrines of the Lares Compitales being erected there; true to tradition, it was still a festival in which slaves had a prominent part and was apt to lead to such disturbance and disorder in the city that it had from time to time to be suppressed.

Turning to the house cults, nothing is more interesting and typical than the development of the worship of Vesta. Every household has its own hearth cult in the city no less than in the country, but the hearth of the state is the hearth of the

king. Accordingly we find the shrine of Vesta, round in shape according to the old tradition, next to the king's palace at the west end of the Forum. There the sacred fire is kept alight from year's end to year's end, and only suffered to go out and be rekindled on March 1, the New Year's day of the old calendar. The Vestal Virgins, according to a probable conjecture, represented the king's daughters, whose duty it was to keep the hearth of the king always burning, so that any member of the community might come to get fire for himself; it is significant in this connexion that in Republican times they were under the guardianship of the Pontifex Maximus, who took over the legal side of the king's religious duties.

They had also the charge of 'Vesta's store-house' (penus Vestae), which contained the most sacred religious emblems, but was most likely at first the store of the king's household. In close connexion with it was developed the solemn ceremony of the Vestalia: from June 7 to June 15 the penus Vestae was thrown open to all Roman matrons, who visited the shrine and made their offerings. These days were not only 'nefasti,' no business might be transacted on them, but also 'religiosi'; on them marriages might not be celebrated and the priestess of Jupiter might not hold intercourse with her husband, or cut her hair, or pare her nails. Only when, on the 15th, the shrine had been swept and the refuse thrown into the Tiber, did the solemn period come to an end. This is clearly, if a familiar term may be used, a solemn and religious 'spring-cleaning' and we find Vesta and her virgins once again closely connected with the work of the household, though now on the grand scale of the state.

Vesta, then, in spite of the aggrandisement of her cult remains always true to her original nature. But some of the other *The Spirits in* spirits greatly changed *Civic Character* their character. Janus, for instance, the 'door spirit,' becomes associated with the 'door' of the state at the north-east corner of the Forum, the door opened in time of war and shut only when Rome was at peace with

all the world. Moreover, by a process of abstraction very notable in the developing religious thought of Rome, he comes to be considered the 'god of beginnings' generally. To him as 'father of the morning' is sacred the first hour of the day; to him in the new calendar is dedicated the first month of the year (Januarius). Yet he too never acquires a bust till 217 B.C.

Juno, whose original character is by no means clear, develops in the state in two different aspects. First she becomes pre-eminently the deity of women: as the 'light-bringer' (Lucina) she presides over childbirth; the rites of marriage are in her special charge, and on March 1 she is worshipped at the 'Matrons' festival. Even the servant-maids have their own day of offering to Juno on July 7. On the other hand she shares, as his counterpart, in the honours of Jupiter: white cows are offered to her as white steers are to him; as he presides over the Ides (the middle day of the month) so does Juno over the Kalends.

Still more significant is the fate of Mars: from being an agricultural spirit he develops with the new needs of a state confronted with enemies into the god of war and his old character drops away into oblivion. He has the warlike wolf for his sacred animal; the spears and the sacred shields are his emblems, and during the month devoted to him they are carried round the city with song and dance by his leaping Salii clad in the full war dress. His altar is in 'Mars' field' (Campus Martius) outside the city boundary—for nothing connected with war is allowed within—and in his honour

are held various festivals of a military character at other times in the year.

But by far the greatest development is that of Jupiter. He retains his association with the vine festivals still performed as a survival in the city, and as sky god

in the state he has his titles of Lucetius 'the light-bringer,' and Fulgur, 'lord of the thunder-bolt.' But more than any other deity Jupiter rises to the needs of the new city community. It is brought into collision with its neighbours in war: Jupiter is now the 'stayer of rout' (Stator) and the 'giver of victory' (Victor); to the sacred oak of Iuppiter Feretrius on the Capitol must be brought the spoils of victory and to his Capitoline temple the victorious general passes in his triumphal procession. In civil life too he is the maintainer of justice between man and man in his character of Iuppiter Fidius, the god of oaths. More and more he emerges above all other gods, and the life of the community centres round him, until enshrined in his great temple on the Capitol he comes to embody in his title of Jupiter Optimus

Maximus the very greatness and majesty of the Roman state itself.

Thus by a strange but peculiarly Roman combination of conservatism and adaptation the old agricultural worship passed into the religion of the state. The process brought with it the creation of something like a religious hierarchy. The old Roman triad, Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus, had long had their special priests, or flamines, 'kindlers of the sacrifice,' and flamines were also attached to certain minor deities of the old order. They were personages definitely set apart for the service of the gods; they might not hold office in the



CONSECRATED PRIEST

Many of the old Latin gods—as, for example, Mars—were served by priests who devoted themselves solely to religion and were forbidden to hold civil offices. Such were the Salii.



*Louvre; photo, Giraudon*



state and their life was hedged round with many taboos. But when there was no longer a king who could act as paterfamilias to the state his religious functions had to be divided. Some of them fell to the civil magistrates, some to an ecclesiastical official who still retained the title of

Rex Sacrorum ('king of the ceremonies'); but far the greater part to the college of the pontifices, 'the bridge builders,' the meaning of whose name is still a mystery. Among them the Pontifex Maximus who held office for life, was practically the religious head of the community. He lived in the royal palace, appointed the Rex Sacrorum and the Vestal Virgins and had control of the performance of the state religion. There were also colleges of augurs, who interpreted the omens and auspices taken by the magistrates, and of the 'fetials' who were concerned with the declaration of war and the making of peace.

All this multiplication of officials implied organization and formalisation of cult:



PROTOTYPE OF THE MODERN VATICAN IN ANCIENT ROME

On the fall of the Roman monarchy the more important of the religious functions performed by the king devolved upon the Pontifex Maximus—the chief priest and head of the college of pontifices. He lived in the royal palace, of which the ruins and a restoration are shown above. It was not merely his own residence but also the centre of his administration containing apartments for his staff, the archives of the pontifical college, assembly rooms and chapels.

From Lanciani: *The Roman Forum* reconstruction from Platner: *Ancient Rome*

there grew up side by side with the civil law the 'ius divinum,' an embodiment of all the traditions of religious observance and a code, as it were, of the relations of god and man. Of this the pontifices were the interpreters: it was they who ordained the festivals and until the publication of the Calendar, which was said to have been first made in 304 B.C., the people waited for the announcement of the pontifex at the beginning of the month to know what festivals were to come.

It is not difficult to see what the effect of this great change must have been. The transference of agricultural festivals to the city made for unreality, the stereotyping of ritual made for formality, and the concentration of the performance of worship in the hands of priesthoods divorced religion from the life of the ordinary man. In the household no doubt, and on the country farms—which, as great estates grew, became fewer and fewer—the spirit of the 'religion of Numa' survived. But the state religion, except in so far as the cult of Jupiter expressed Roman patriotism, became more and more moribund. Its very elaboration and perfection created the need of more, and men began to reach out to welcome new ideas and forms of religion from abroad.

Already in the regal epoch, as Rome came into contact with her neighbours, she had begun to adopt their gods, and side by side with the old 'gods of the soil' there was growing up a class of 'new-comers.' They were adopted or admitted for various reasons, as may be seen in three typical instances. The growth of the city


state soon produced a large class of craftsmen and handiworkers; they had no place in the old agricultural life and none of the old deities could well be treated as their protector. The Etruscan settlers introduced for

this purpose Minerva, who became the patroness of the craft-guilds, including even scribes, doctors, schoolmasters and flute-players. The high place which she held in the city state is shown by her inclusion with Jupiter and Juno in the Etruscan triad on the Capitol.

In 499 B.C. Rome fought a battle with her neighbours, led by the inhabitants of Tusculum, at Lake Regillus, and legend tells how the twin deities, Castor and Pollux, in the course of the battle came over to the side of Rome, and were thereafter worshipped in the city. The legend may be so far true that it was always a matter of prime importance among primitive peoples to win over the favour of their enemies' gods, and the cult of the twins may have been set up in Rome with the purpose of weakening the religious strength of their opponents. It came to stay, and to this day may be seen in the Forum some pillars of the stately

temple built for them by Augustus. Thirdly, a deity might be brought to Rome by settlers coming from neighbouring towns: this was probably the case with the strange cult of Hercules at the Forum Boarium.

It will be noticed that three of the deities thus introduced into Rome from the neighbouring towns were of Greek origin, Castor, Pollux (Polydeuces) and Hercules (Heracles). They had reached Tusculum



INTERPRETER OF OMENS

In Rome it was the magistrates who 'took' the auspices, and the college of augurs that interpreted them. Above, an augur in his official robes and bearing the 'lituus' or sacred wand

British Museum

and Tibur doubtless from the Greek cities of southern Italy, and must have been firmly established there for some time before they passed on to Rome. But Rome, too, was soon to feel the direct influence of Greece, at first from Cumae, the northernmost and oldest of the Greek colonies. Legend tells how the old crone from Cumae came to Tarquin the proud, the last of the Etruscan kings, and offered

for sale her collection of oracles; how, as the king refused, she threw more and more of the oracles into the flames, and how, at last, overcome by curiosity, he purchased the three remaining rolls. These were the famous Sibylline books, which, however they were in fact acquired, exercised a profound influence on Roman religion for some three centuries. They were a collection of oracles in Greek verse recommending on the occasion of famine and other disasters the establishment of some new Greek cult or ritual, and it became the normal last resort in a crisis to open the Sibylline books and obey their behests. This was, no doubt, but an extension of the ready admittance of new religious ideas and practices which is always characteristic of polytheism, and had already been exhibited by Rome; but it had far-reaching results in that it not merely substituted Greek ritual, shared by the whole populace, for the priestly ritual of the state cult, but also the conception of gods with human form and relations for the vaguer idea of the spirits.

Somewhere about 500 B.C. came the first introduction under the instructions of the Sibylline books—that of Apollo himself, the patron of the Sibyl at Cumae. We do not know the date or occasion for certain, and it was not till 433 B.C. that a temple was built for him outside the city-boundary, as became a foreigner, close by one of the great gates of Rome. Apollo always retained his Greek name, but on the next appearance of 'newcomers' we meet, for the first time, the habit of identifying these Greek gods with old Roman spirits, which was the most potent cause of the modification of the old ideas.

In 496 B.C. famine caused a consultation of the Sibylline books, and they recommended the introduction of the Greek

deities Demeter, Dionysus and Kore, under the names of the old Latin spirits Ceres, Liber and Libera, the latter an old divinity pair concerned with the growth of the corn. Liber becomes henceforth a wine deity and assumes the characteristics and personality of the Greek Bacchus. In the same way, later crises caused the introduction of Hermes, henceforth identified with Mercury, an old commercial deity, of Poseidon, identified with Neptune, and of Asclepius, the healing-god, Latinised as Aesculapius and settled in a temple on the Tiber island. A still greater innovation was made just before the opening of our era, in a great crisis of the Second Punic War in 205 B.C., when, under the orders of the Sibylline books, the 'Great Mother' was brought—in the form of a meteoric stone—from Pessinus in Asia Minor, the first of the oriental deities worshipped with ecstatic orgies to receive the official recognition of the Roman State.

Hardly less revolutionary in effect than the arrival of these anthropomorphic deities was the establishment of certain Greek forms of ritual. In 399 B.C. a severe winter followed by an attack of plague led to recourse to the Sibylline books, which or—**Advent of Greek ritual**  
dained, not the admission of a new deity, but the celebration of a new rite, known henceforth in Rome as the 'spreading of the couch' (*lectisternium*). Couches ('*pulvinaria*') were set out, and on them were exhibited the effigies of Apollo and Latona, Diana and Hercules, Mercury and Neptune (a pair of Greek gods, a pair of Italian 'newcomers,' and a pair of the old spirits, now Graecised), and in front of them tables were spread with offerings of food. It was a crude piece of anthropomorphism, calculated to have a great effect on the popular imagination. Closely connected with the *lectisternium* was the ritual of the 'supplicatio,' ordained on special occasions by consuls or Senate. The whole populace, men and women, wreathed and bearing laurel branches in their hands—just like Greek suppliants—would make the round of the temples, and, as we are often told, of all the 'couches,' the men offering wine and incense, the women kneeling in prayer with loosened hair.

Lastly came the institution of the games on great occasions, not only of thanksgiving but of mourning, when the populace gathered to witness dramatic performances or races or contests of gladiators. In time the games almost lost their religious significance, but more and more they became the occasions of vulgar display for the givers, or of delight in brutal exhibitions for the audience.

The history of the old Latin religion and its developments has thus been brought up to about 200 B.C. It has been seen how what was originally a simple sense of power greater than human expressed itself in the cult of the household. With the growth of the city state this worship was enlarged and adapted to meet new needs; but this transference led to organization and formalisation, which stereotyped religion and placed it in the hands of a professional priesthood. For one reason or another Rome began to admit within its walls the cults of the neighbouring Italian towns, and in so doing came into contact with Greek ideas and customs. These innovations seemed for the time to satisfy the wants of the populace; but they debased the ideas of the old religion by introducing a crude anthropomorphism and practices based on transient emotion, which were emphasised by the first contact with the orgiastic cults of the East.

During the period of the preceding Chronicle no great changes took place.


Rome was busy with the practical expansion of her empire and the wars which it entailed. The state cult was still celebrated in all its minutiae by the official priests, and the people expressed their public emotions in supplications and games. The later history of religion at Rome must be left to subsequent chapters (see Chapters 67, 74 and 80), but a very brief summary may here be given. In the first century B.C. the influence of Greek literature became paramount; the study of the Greek poets stimulated anthropomorphism by a more thorough identification of the gods of Greece with the Roman deities, and in particular by the attachment of Greek legends to the Graecised gods of Rome. The study of

Greek philosophy brought a profound scepticism with regard to traditional religious belief, and, in so far as it was constructive, introduced a shadowy philosophic conception of deity.

These two influences affected the educated classes. Meanwhile, the people turned more and more to the oriental cults, and pre-eminently to that of the 'Great Mother,' with her mutilated priests and excited processions, and to the Egyptian Isis, whose worship involved an element of emotional asceticism; it is said, too, that the victorious soldiers of Sulla brought to Rome for the first time the worship of Mithras, which was destined to play so large a part in the religion of the Roman armies. Augustus, when he succeeded to the principate of Julius, endeavoured to make something of a religious revival, and to bring together the various strains of legitimate worship. For this purpose he built the new temple of Apollo on the Palatine, established a new shrine of Vesta within his own palace, and permitted the worship of his own Genius; the old Roman religion and the imported cults were thus to be concentrated in the household of the emperor. In the succeeding century popular religion hovered between the oriental cults and Caesar worship, while the learned were feeling after a syncretism which might lead to a kind of philosophic monotheism. Into this atmosphere burst the revolutionary teaching of Christianity.

But throughout all these shifting changes, among the simpler folk of the country the old cults of the household and the fields lingered on. Christianity found its most stubborn opponents, not in Greek anthropomorphism nor in Greek philosophy, not even in Caesar worship or the oriental cults, but rather in 'paganism,' the deep-rooted religion of the agricultural 'pagi,' or farming communities. Nor is it too much to say that it was never wholly vanquished; the Roman Church owes something of the elaboration of its ceremonial, and its care for the little things of life, to the old Roman religion, and the many local and functional saints of present-day Italy are in effect the successors of the ancient spirits.

Later changes  
in religion



#### GREEK ARCHITECTURE FOR THE ROMAN WORSHIP OF GREEK DEITIES

Laconia was the first home of the worship of Castor and Pollux, but it early spread to Italy. Tuscanum became a special site of their cult, and Roman tradition averred that at the Battle of Lake Regillus in 496 B.C. they had been invoked, in accordance with the custom of appealing to the enemy's gods, and had given victory; and that in memory of this a temple was dedicated to them in the Forum. In any case an ancient temple was replaced by this later building.

*Photo, Allinari*

# HOW GREEK CULTURE CAME TO ROME

The softening Influence of Hellenism upon  
the Life and Morals of the Latin peoples

By R. S. CONWAY Litt.D.

Hulme Professor of Latin, Victoria University of Manchester; Author of *The Making of Latin*, etc.

**G**RAECIA capta ferum captorem cepit'—captive Greece took captive her uncivilized conqueror. The stage in the growth of humanity which Horace's words happily describe may most fitly be studied in connexion with the events of the last century but one B.C., since it was then that the process of adapting Greek ideas to Roman life became conscious and deliberate. But it had begun at least three or four centuries sooner; and another four or five centuries were needed to complete it.

How far back the influence began appears curiously from the fact that the name by which the Romans called their neighbours, namely, Greek, belonged properly to a tribe on what we should call the Albanian coast, which had disappeared completely in historical times. But we may begin this survey with the first record we have of an attempt made by anyone who spoke Latin to write it down; the only way to do this was to use the alphabet of the neighbouring Greek colony of Cumæ. This was about 600 B.C., and the evidence from which we know the date is of some interest.

The words are inscribed upon a costly gift: 'Manios has made me for Numasios.' This was written in old Latin from right to left in characters which cannot yet be called those of the Latin alphabet; they are the Greek script of Cumæ pressed into the service of a non-Greek language; and with them begins the history of Latin writing. The gift (see page 1599) was a beautiful gold brooch, found at Praeneste (modern Palestrina) with other remains of a kind that the archaeologists can refer with confidence to the second half of the seventh century (650-600) B.C. It is not

quite an accident that the first writer of Latin should have been a person of some refinement who turned to his Greek neighbours for help in carrying out a generous purpose. From this small private venture in an art which at that time only the Greeks could teach, it is a far cry to the work of S. Jerome in the fourth century A.D., translating the New Testament into the spoken Latin of his day, and thereby creating the Vulgate, which remains the official text of the central document of the central section of Christendom.

The work of Jerome is typical of the process we are considering, because it finally combined two distinct streams of influence, which moved for long in the same direction, but which affected different sides of life and, for a long time, very different kinds of people. These two streams we may call respectively the popular and the literary current, though, as we shall see, they mingled at more than one point. The second, when once it had begun to flow, was the more powerful, because it was from this that the Romans drew their knowledge of the best that the Greeks had to give. Yet it is quite certain that without support from the other side the power of Greek literature alone could hardly have won the domination which it held over the Roman mind. For the effect of popular contact with Greek ways in every-day concerns and in satisfying commonplace needs was unsought and largely unconscious; and for this very reason it had singular penetrating power.

Suppose that we lived to-day in a nation where there were no schoolmasters or teachers of any kind save those im-

Two distinct  
streams of influence

ported from some one foreign country; and again that all our doctors, and such medical knowledge as they or their patients had, came from that same source. It is certain that whether we liked it or not most of our ways of thought and some of our ways of speech would be continually affected by this peaceful penetration. Suppose further that a considerable proportion

**Peaceful penetration**  
by social contact of our domestic servants (if we had any), certainly all the cleverest of them, came from (or through) that same people; and that our sea-captains and shipwrights, our builders, architects and engineers, our astronomers and other men of science and learning, our bankers, insurance-agents and company-promoters, our actors, musicians and singers, as one by one all these professions found a footing amongst us, were all, or very nearly all, drawn from the same nation; and finally, that from them, too, the whole institution of theatrical performance had been introduced into our own country for the first time, and that every one of the plays performed, whether serious or humorous, was a translation of an original written in their language, and put into metres strange to us and invented by them—take all this for granted, and such imaginations would still be an incomplete picture of the ways by which the tide of Greek civilization spread through the homes and cities of Italy, in Rome more than in any other.

Now until the epoch in which Rome became mistress of Italy and counted as her subject allies all the Greek colonies dotted along its southern and western coasts—that is, until after the conquest of Tarentum in 272 B.C.—the channel through which this popular influence flowed was almost wholly mercantile. But it must be remembered that merchandise in those days included slaves, who brought with them far more words and ideas into Roman homes than did particular imports like olive oil, or figs, or roses, which carried only their own names, or at most those of their various kinds and sources. Of the mass of Greek words which in the end came into Latin use (they have been carefully collected by

more than one scholar and their number is not less than ten thousand), a limited but still considerable number belong to the oldest stratum—that is, they are words introduced by actual process of intercourse in speech.

Many of these relate to things material, such as the word 'gubernare', to steer a ship (whence the English 'govern'), which comes from a Greek word of the same meaning; and a whole group of words relating to the sea, as, for example, 'scopulus', rock, 'pirata', pirate, 'gripus', drag-net, 'emblema', ship's ensign, 'prora', prow, and a large number of fish names. Others were introduced into Rome not directly from the Greeks but through the Etruscans, whom, at the beginning of Roman history, we find to be the masters of Rome, Latium and Tuscany, and of many settlements along the west coast as far south as Surrentum; such as 'groma', surveyor's table (the Etruscan form of the Greek 'gnōmon', pointer), 'persona', a mask, from an Etruscan abbreviation of the Greek 'prosōpon', face, with 'scēna', stage, and 'schēma', get-up or make-up, and some other stage terms.

Special mention must be made of a small and curious document, an earthenware vase with three cavities, found in 1880, which must have been deposited in a tomb **Evidence of**  
on the Quirinal in Rome **the Duenos Vase**  
somewhere about 400

B.C. This is known as the Duenos Vase, from the name of the person who mentions himself in the inscription scratched round its sides. The three sentences which it contains were for long a puzzle to Latin scholars, and no fewer than thirty-seven different interpretations have been put forward! But the later renderings differ only in details, and it is generally agreed that it contains a curse, which was, so to speak, posted in the tomb of some dead person, who, it was supposed, would take it with him to the infernal deities, who were to execute it.

Now this curse contains a curious formula: 'Let not the Virgin'—that is Proserpine, queen of the underworld—'be hospitable to thee,' which is taken directly from a Greek formula that appears in a number of curses found on the coast.

of Asia Minor at Halicarnassus; a group which provides also another formula: 'Let him be carried off as a slave bought and sold to Demeter,' which appears in a curse of the third century B.C. found in Campania. These, like most magical documents, were written by folk whom we should call illiterate; though that description might be applied to almost the whole of Rome in the fourth century B.C.; for the only persons who then possessed anything that could be called education were a handful of religious state officials who regulated the calendar and who kept a record of the names of the chief magistrates every year. By them, about 450 B.C., the first Roman code of laws had been engraved—the famous Twelve Tables—in an alphabet taken partly from the Greeks of Cumae and partly from the Etruscans, who had learnt theirs also, probably, from the Greeks.


By the same group of priests must have been set up the oldest public monument of Roman life which we possess; this is known as the Forum inscription, and was found in 1900 (see page 1596). It was almost certainly cut

Greek letters in the in the period of the  
Forum inscription Twelve Tables. If

only it were complete, instead of being five sundered fragments, no one of which completes a sentence, our knowledge both of early Latin and early Rome would have been greatly enriched by the find. The letters may be said to belong to the Latin alphabet, but still show some characteristic Greek forms.

But the same piety which erected it, in the shape of an elongated pyramid or obelisk, perhaps four feet high, demolished all but the lowest quarter of its length, during some period when the Forum was being re-paved at about eighteen inches or two feet above its earlier level. This renovation it is reasonable to attribute to the process of removing the pollution which had been caused, according to ancient ideas, by the Gaulish invasion of the city in 390 B.C. The words which remain show clearly that the monument marked a particular area of the Forum as consecrated to some particular purpose; and probably enjoined that no cattle were to be driven across it.

Its interest for our present purpose lies in the fact that the writing ran along the length of the obelisk, and that its direction changed in alternate lines, one line running upwards and the next running down. Now, we read that the laws of Solon were inscribed on many-sided revolving pillars of wood and also on stone columns, the writing being not necessarily up and down but certainly to and fro, about a century earlier at Athens. Further, we may note that the fashion of writing up



GREEK MAGIC IN A ROMAN CURSE

Characteristic Greek forms appear in this early fourth century Latin inscription, which runs round the outer edge of three vases joined together in a triangle. It is a curse, and is known as the Duencos inscription from the first word (top).

and down the sides of an obelisk appears also in a corner of Italy which was especially subject to Greek influence—the region of the Veneti—where this was the proper method of inscribing tombstones in the third century B.C. and earlier. It is by no means a mere coincidence that the whole basis of what may be called the first constitution of Rome, namely, the arrangement of the citizens into classes according to their wealth, and their allotment to different military divisions accordingly, resembles the timocratic constitution given to Athens by Solon. The finding of this fragment has supplied peculiarly convincing evidence of the source from which the Romans in the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. were deriving many of their ideas.



At the beginning, therefore, the help which the Romans obtained from their Greek neighbours was of a strictly practical kind. But even in this restricted intercourse they became familiar with a certain number of Greek ideas on the non-material side of life. If Greek deities like Proserpine were needed for cursing one's enemies, the Italian learnt also from his

Greek neighbours to invoke more pleasant personalities. Among these were Hercules, whose worship, especially at the Ara Maxima, as a patron of trade and travel, is at least as old as the foundation of Rome; and next to him, in order of antiquity, were the twin gods Castor and Pollux, the deliverers of storm-pressed sailors; and later on Apollo, the giver of oracles.

This last deity had been brought by the Achaeans from the north, and even in Greece possessed considerably higher characteristics than the older gods of the Mediterranean peoples. Among the Greeks he tended more and more to be counted the patron of intellectual and ethical progress. At Rome the different ideas associated from time to time with his worship are almost an index of the spiritual growth of the Roman people. By the time when Augustus crowned the Palatine Hill with the magnificent temple and library in his honour (28-24 B.C.), the name of Apollo had become synonymous with nobility of morals and enlightenment of mind; and it was by no means an accident that he was chosen by this shrewd peacemaker and reformer to be his especial patron.

When we turn in thought from the Queen of Darkness, invoked in obscure maledictions in 400 B.C., to the God of Light, whose glorious attributes inspired the founder of the Roman Empire, which was to give the world four centuries of 'Roman peace,' the vastness of the change in thought and manners that has taken place gives us some measure of the power of the second source of Greek influence—the power, that is, of Greek literature. But the beginning even of this influence, which is almost the same thing as the beginning of literature at Rome, was rooted in practical needs.

In 272 B.C. one of the Greek captives from Tarentum, named Andronicus, came

to Rome as a slave of the Roman general Marcus Livius, whose name he afterwards took, according to custom, on receiving from him his freedom. The service by which he earned it was that of teaching his master's children, in the first place to read and write. But what were they to read? Greek books there were in plenty, but no Latin, though there was a species of literature orally current, as, for example, the family traditions rehearsed at every nobleman's funeral, and, almost certainly, popular ballads in Saturnian verse—a rough kind of jog-trot metre scanned mainly by accent, rather like Longfellow's *Hiawatha*, only with six feet instead of four to a line. Utilising this metre Andronicus translated Homer's *Odyssey* into Latin, to use in teaching his pupils; and in so doing he produced the first piece of Latin literature; though the first author actually to write down something in Latin seems to have been the blind censor Appius Claudius, whose famous speech against peace with king Pyrrhus after his defeat of the Romans in 280 B.C. was reported in writing. The same powerful person had used the new art of writing to put together a collection of proverbs, some of them from Greek sources.

From narrative poetry Andronicus proceeded to drama; and the representation of a Greek tragedy translated by him in Rome in 240 B.C. is a turning point in literary history.

Andronicus used some of the Greek metres; and he was followed in this by the first Latin poet, Naevius, who, besides his narrative, in Saturnian metre, of the first Punic War (264-241 B.C.), translated a number of Greek tragedies into iambic and trochaic measures before the end of the third century B.C. In less than a quarter of a century the Roman people had learnt to love the drama; and the only plays they yet had were taken from the Greek.

This is true of all the complete plays we possess, twenty-one of Plautus and six of Terence, and of a great number by other writers which we know by fragments only. Some, however, combined material from two Greek plays, and it is clear that the dramatist might use his original with

Greek source  
of Roman drama

some freedom. Several of these plays were written before 200 B.C., but they were continually performed through many centuries, so that the earliest productions of Latin dramatists seem to have been also some of the most popular. Since, unfortunately, their Greek originals have all been lost, we cannot test directly the degree to which they were modified. We can see, however, plainly enough, that Plautus set himself to introduce a large number of features of popular Roman life; so that, although the scene and story of his plays are always characteristically Greek, they could nevertheless be enjoyed by the ordinary Roman audience.

A glance at one or two plays will show us how the elements are blended. In the *Mostellaria* ('Ghost Story') the young lover, while his wealthy and devout father Theopropides ('Mr. Godly') is trading abroad, borrows money, buys his mistress from her master the 'leno' and marries her. While the wedding festivities are still going on, his father returns to Athens, and is faced by the real hero (at all events the central figure) of the play, the slave Tranio, who scares him off with a long story of how a ghost (and apparently a noisy one) has infested the

family residence; and he explains the sounds which occasionally proceed from the banqueting party inside as being caused by the ghost!

When Tranio is further faced by the visit of the money-lender, who calls to dun the young master for the interest on his loan, Tranio explains to Theopropides that the loan in question has been incurred in order to buy the house next door. He then contrives, in an amusing scene, to trick the real owner of that house into allowing Theopropides to go all over it, thinking that it is his son's property but abstaining from alluding to the purchase so as not to hurt his neighbour's feelings; since, according to Tranio, that neighbour has had to raise money suddenly, and so has parted with the house at a very low price.

Of course, the truth comes to light, and Tranio takes refuge on the altar, from which Theopropides, though he threatens him with all sorts of penalties, is too scrupulous to drag him. But a wealthy

friend of the young lover comes to the rescue and pays off the debt; and on the strength of this Theopropides consents to his son's marriage. The end of this scene is lost by a tiresome gap in the manuscripts, and it is possible that it contained some statement showing that the bride, Philematium ('Little Kiss'), has been discovered to have been born free and an Athenian citizen. This would be the common ending of a story of this kind; it appears for instance in the romantic play of the *Rudens* ('The Fisherman's Rope'); and it is certainly suggested by the charming character of the heroine herself. Earlier in the play, in what is perhaps the prettiest scene in all Latin drama, she is discovered at her toilet preparing for the banquet, and receiving sage advice from her old attendant Scapha, who proceeds to reprove her for her faithfulness to her lover on the ground that men are fickle, and that a bright young girl should have more than one string to her bow. This advice Philematium indignantly rejects, in terms quite worthy of a Roman maiden: and her modesty, refinement and loyalty are pictured with the fresh sympathy in which the greatness of Plautus lies.

Now this story is thoroughly Greek. Roman fathers did not go away on trading expeditions for months at a time; nor were they commonly the victims of such pious superstition as made Tranio's master an easy prey to his slave. Still less were slave girls ever made into brides. Capable slaves, of course, enjoyed great influence with their masters; and, as we can see from Cicero's Letters to Tiro and Horace's conversation with his bailiff, some degree of familiar intercourse was common enough. But the unblushing and often impertinent confidence which the slaves of later Greek Comedy assume towards their masters could only be tolerated in Rome as an extravaganza—the picture of a topsy-turvy world, amusing because it was the opposite of reality. Nevertheless, dreams may sometimes come true; and there can be no doubt that the continual familiarity with the gentler manners and generous sentiment of romances like the *Rudens* (in which the heroine, a refined

and charming girl, is restored to freedom and to her genial father from whom she had been kidnapped in infancy) or the *Captivi* ('The Prisoners,' in which a slave faces prison and torture to secure his young master's escape) did something to humanise the rough tastes and rudimentary morals of the Roman populace.

That this was possible was largely due to the thoroughly Roman and Italian temper

which Plautus infused into a great number of details. **Greek and Roman blend in Plautus's comedies**

His characters, indeed, often drop into Greek, and always use Greek exclamations—as, for instance, 'euge,' well done; 'sophos,' good for you; 'papaie,' oh dear—just as in English we have taken 'bravo' and 'dear me' (*dio mio*) from Italian. Still more often they Latinise the shape of their Greek words, as 'harpagavit' (he has hooked him); 'malacissandus est' (we must stroke him down). His parasites, too, are a thoroughly Greek institution, and behave with a freedom which the most hardened diner-out at Rome would not have dared to take; but in most of the plays they fill one or more laughable scenes by describing their experience of hunger, and displaying their knowledge of good things, in thoroughly Roman terms. In the same way the slaves, though they behave with Athenian effrontery, are always in dread of the stern punishments in use at Rome, such as being branded on the forehead, or put to death on the cross.

In the comedy of Terence we breathe a different atmosphere—that, namely, of the later Greek Comedy pure and simple, with hardly a feature that can be called Roman. Terence was not even a Greek by birth, but an African who had had a Greek education, and who came to Rome as a slave, but after receiving his freedom was admitted to the friendship of the Scipios. The refinement of his language and the delicacy of his wit, perhaps one ought even to add the subtlety of his ethical criticism, are certainly connected with this friendship; though for our present purpose it matters little how much of his work we regard as his own and how much as due to his noble patrons who were steeped in Greek lore.

The stories of the plays, of course, are Greek, and though they are true enough to some fundamental instincts of humanity, and to some of the commonest experiences of life, never to lack admirers in any age, they were not nearly so popular in Rome as the livelier action and wider horizon of Plautus. In the *Phormio*, for instance, the whole plot turns on a peculiarity of the Athenian law, that the nearest male relative of an unmarried orphan girl was bound either to marry her or to procure a husband for her by offering a sufficiently attractive dowry; and if he chose the first alternative, he was expected to divorce his wife (if he were married) in order to be free to marry his ward.

If Plautus had handled the theme, we might have had the same leading characters, but the old men would have shown some acquaintance with the Roman Forum and the towns **Terence's Contribution to Roman education**

and customs of Italy; and the parasite Phormio (who pretends to be the heroine's cousin) would have carried through his part with boisterous, if not romantic, zeal and vigorous humour. As it is, we have what is probably a more consistent and incisive study of one side of human life as it appeared in Athenian society of the decadence. In a word, the chief contribution of Terence to Roman education was probably of a destructive kind, questioning every moral dogma.

Yet that this influence had a positive side of no small value may be judged even from a single saying—though it is only put forward as an excuse for a neighbour's curiosity, the famous line in *The Self-Tormentor*—'I am a man and nothing human is outside my interests.'

To the needs of education and amusement there was added another which in the troublous decades of the Hannibalic War (218–202 B.C.) seemed no less practical. After Hannibal's third overwhelming victory at Cannae, in 216 B.C., where Rome lost no fewer than eighty thousand of her citizens, the Romans sent an embassy to the famous oracle of Apollo at Delphi. Besides giving wise advice against panic, this authority recommended them to make offerings to himself when prosperity returned. Four years later, when

their prospects had improved in the war, we find games in honour of Apollo first celebrated at Rome. They were made annual in 208, and in this same year we find Andronicus himself officially charged to compose a hymn of supplication to be chanted by twenty-seven maidens, marching in procession through the city, in order to beseech divine help against Hasdrubal, the brother of Hannibal, who was bringing great reinforcements to him from Spain. After the tide of fortune had turned by the defeat of Hasdrubal in 207, one of the most noteworthy acts of thanksgiving, undertaken with the sanction of the Delphic Oracle, was the introduction of a new deity—the Great Mother, from Mount Ida in the Troad (see page 1753)—a step no doubt connected, we may note in passing, with the tradition fostered by Greek writers of the settlement of the Trojan Aeneas in Latium.

Few incidents throw more vivid light on the popular feelings of that date, and on the steps by which enlightened statesmen thought it well to satisfy them, than the elaborate ceremonies with which the black meteoric stone that the goddess was supposed to inhabit was solemnly fetched from her temple at Pessinus and received with rejoicing in 205 B.C., to be thereafter honoured at Rome by an annual festival.

So far we have noted the ways in which ordinary people at Rome had come to learn the ideas of their Greek neighbours.

To all this was added the power of Greek political ideals upon the governing class as those ideals came to be understood, especially of the Greek conception of free government. This was congenial enough to the old Roman spirit, and it is not surprising that Flamininus and other great commanders should have rejoiced in the task of checking or overthrowing Greek despots like Philip V of Macedon, and of restoring freedom to the Greek cities.

But in making themselves champions of the freedom for which Pericles and Demosthenes had contended, the Romans were embracing larger ideals of life than were contained in the hardy discipline by which their ancestors had learnt to put their country first. The Greek conception of freedom included elements of individual

and social culture which were new to Rome; and thus, almost insensibly, the old Roman principles were reinterpreted in the more humane light of Greek teaching—a process which may be traced all through Roman literature, and which was to find its climax in the work of Vergil, Rome's greatest poet, both in his *Georgics* ('Notes on Farming') and in the *Aeneid*, his national epic. But a century before Vergil was born we find even the sternest opponent of Greek fashions and Greek theories, the censor Cato, speaking as cordially as Flamininus himself could of the Greek champions of liberty. 'I look upon a king,' said Cato on one occasion (meaning by 'king' a despot of the Macedonian type), 'as a creature that feeds upon human flesh; and of all the famous kings I find not one to be compared with Epaminondas or Pericles or Themistocles or our own Manius Curius.'

This reverence for the most practical of all Greek principles exercised decisive force in establishing the ascendancy of Greek literature at Rome. Beside it Roman need of Greek Science and only less potent was the need which Roman generals continually felt, in their conflict with the powers of the Mediterranean, for the help of Greek science in every kind of military and naval work. The Roman general Marcellus was completely baffled in his naval assaults on the city of Syracuse by the machines for shooting and grappling invented by the Greek mathematician Archimedes, who was in the city at the time (see Chap. 73). His engines were so formidable—some of them hoisted the Roman ships half out of the water and then dropped them again—that Marcellus had to desist entirely from the assault, and took the city only by two years' blockade. When Archimedes was slain by an ignorant soldier, Marcellus was grieved, buried him with honour and placed his family out of reach of want.

A companion picture, of much the same date, is that of young Scipio, destined to be the conqueror of Hannibal, whose study of Greek theories of the tides enabled him to predict that the lagoon which sheltered the Carthaginian fortress of New Carthage would be only waist-deep at a certain hour on a certain day.

Through this knowledge he took the town, and its capture marked the end of Carthaginian predominance in Spain. It is not irrelevant, however, to note further that Scipio thought it well to represent the shallowness of the water to his soldiers as a miracle wrought by Neptune on their behalf. This, he knew, would be more likely both to be believed and to arouse confidence among his soldiers than a plain statement of the fact.

His pretence is explicitly praised by the sceptical Greek historian Polybius, who regards the whole of Scipio's interest in religion as a politic (and admirable) fraud. But the Roman historian Livy, with somewhat deeper insight, allows room for the mystical side which undoubtedly existed in Scipio's temperament, and which prompted him to many acts, indeed to a lifelong practice, of religious observance; but the deliberate mystification which he practised upon his soldiers Livy clearly condemns. The two points of view, of Scipio and of his soldiers, and the rational but also religious temper of Livy, are all typical of the ferment in the Roman mind which had begun in Scipio's day and was to continue for another two centuries.

In school, then, in the theatre, in religion, in war, in statecraft and in every kind of knowledge the Romans of the second century B.C. were eagerly absorbing Greek ideas. We cannot wonder that that century witnessed the rise of authors who aspired to do for Rome what the great Greek writers, whom they took for their masters, had done for Greece, and above all for Athens. Stern farmer-soldiers of the old school like Cato, who was censor in 184 B.C., fought hard against the new tide. In a characteristic passage in his treatise *On Agriculture*, the first prose book ever written in Latin, he advises his son thus: 'Sell off promptly old or sick cattle, old farm-stock, old slaves, sick slaves, and every other superfluity'; and his views of women were hardly less drastic than his view of slaves. It is difficult to say, indeed, whether he disliked the Scipionic circle more for their humanity and refinement of character—Scipio Africanus himself was famous for

his clemency, and for his chivalrous treatment of women—or for the new and softer ways of living which they encouraged both in their own households and among their soldiers. But we have seen that even Cato could not help admiring the Greek ideal of freedom; and there is no reason to doubt the story that in his eightieth year he began to learn Greek in order to read Greek authors for himself.

Besides the dramatist Terence, the Scipionic circle included also the poet Ennius, who proved himself the greatest of all the poets who translated Greek tragedies for the stage, and who adapted the metre of Homer to his epic of Roman history—his *Annales*, the great forerunner of the *Aeneid*. Naevius had died lamenting what he thought the extinction of Latin poetry, in a well-known epitaph:

For dying men if deathless gods were free  
To weep the Latin Muse had wept for me:  
For now that Naevius lies in his last home  
The Latin tongue itself is dead at Rome.

All that this actually meant was that the primitive Latin Saturnian was giving way to Greek metres, some of which Naevius himself had introduced; and with the adaptation by Ennius of the Greek hexameter and the Greek elegiac to Latin poetry, Roman literature may be said to be launched on its own career.

When the supremacy of the Greek writers in knowledge, in thought, in the manifold variety of their outlook on human experience was once recognized, they became the centre and standard of intellectual life for every educated Roman. But to the general mass of the Roman people, ready as they were to assimilate Greek culture of the material and commonplace kind, the Greek writers were known only indirectly. One line of influence there was, however, which more and more fused itself with what was best in the mind of every class; and with a brief indication of its nature this chapter may fitly conclude.

One of the incidents in the headstrong campaign which, as we have seen, the old Cato waged against Greek manners, was his demand that the embassy of three

Intellectual ferment  
in the Roman mind

(and admirable) fraud.  
But the Roman his-  
torian Livy, with some-

One influence that  
touched the masses

Greek philosophers, who visited Rome from Athens in 135 B.C., should be dismissed from the city because they were 'corrupting the Roman youth.' His chief objection, we may be sure, was to Carneades, who was then leader of the so-called New Academy, a school of philosophy whose doctrine was the impossibility of certain knowledge on any subject whatever, but especially on moral questions. But with Carneades were two other Greek philosophers, and one of them was a leading Stoic, who no doubt prepared the way for the more permanent influence of his pupil Panaetius who came to Rome not many years later. Carneades and his companions attracted enormous audiences to their lectures in Rome; and Cato's attack itself shows pretty clearly that people in Rome of that day were giving serious attention to the new studies and the inquiries which they prompted.

Panaetius, as well as his friend, the historian Polybius, was attached to the Scipionic circle. We have already seen that that circle was a centre of Greek influence, and the Stoic philosophy, which Panaetius represented, secured almost at once a firm footing in Rome. Its central doctrine—that Man lives to do his duty, not to find pleasure—strongly appealed to the Roman temper, especially as the Stoics included in their conception of duty the claims of a man's country upon him. Perhaps the greatest contribution which Cicero's writings, a century later, made to human progress has lain in his adaptation of a book of Panaetius in his own work, *On Duties*.

In this humane treatise, which has, in fact, played no small part in shaping the public ethics of Christendom, all kinds of duty are considered; of the slave as well as of the free, of women as well as of men. This Stoic teaching was embraced cordially by many thoughtful Romans both in the generation that followed Cato the Censor, and in the subsequent age in which Cato's own grandson became the most famous of all Roman Stoics. But it must not of course be supposed that it spread among the general mass of people with anything like the same speed. The

calamities of the last century of the Republic (133 to 31 B.C.) did indeed produce a reaction in favour of the rival school of the Epicureans—a school whose chief doctrine, in its vulgar form, 'Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die,' was condemned by S. Paul, who had been trained in Stoic surroundings. This kind of teaching, as Warde Fowler points out, has never flourished except in periods of political collapse and acute social distress; and with the restoration of peace by Octavian (31 B.C.) a new impetus was given to the spread of Stoic teaching. By this time it was by no means only a philosophy of the closet or the statesman, though both of these it was. (Stoicism and Epicureanism are more fully examined in Chapter 67.)

The writings of Epictetus, the lame slave of the first century (born about A.D. 50), are only part of a mass of evidence which shows that Stoic doctrine had begun to make a wider appeal and that thus at last the two streams of Greek influence, from above and from below, had begun to unite.

At the same time the Stoic teaching took a more humane colour. Within a few years of Vergil's death (19 B.C.), his *Aeneid* was studied in every school; and in the central episode of the poem, the vision of Anchises in Book VI, Vergil has embodied a statement of the Stoic creed, but filled it with a new note of tenderness and compassion. Some eighty years later, in the famous line of the young poet Lucan, himself a Stoic whom Nero put to death, the Stoic disciple is bidden 'to believe that he was born, not for his own benefit, but for that of the whole world.' In the light of recent study, and especially the concluding chapter of Professor E. V. Arnold's admirable work on Roman Stoicism, there can be no doubt that the main current of ethical progress flowed in the channels of Stoic teaching; and that this teaching, as it spread along the Roman roads through the world, aided not a little to prepare men's minds for a still more humane Gospel that was to proclaim the brotherhood of Greek and Roman, learned and unlearned, bond and free.

# TABLE OF DATES FOR CHRONICLE IX

136	Tribunate and death of Tiberius Gracchus	81	Sulla allows Pompey (aged 3) a Triumph
137	1st of Numania Acquistion of Perseumum	80	Sertorius heads Spaniards and Marians in Spain
138	Suppression of Sicilian slave revolt	79	Sulla reigns
139	Death of Africanus		Sertorius allies with the Mediterranean pirates
	Organization of the Province of Asia (Pergamum)	78	Death of Sulla Insurrection of Lepidus
140	C. Gracchus quaestor in Sardinia	77	Full of Lepidus Pompey goes to Spain
141	Flaccus propraetor, reforms sent to Gaul	76	Sertorius undetected makes treaty with Mithras
	Revolt and punishment of Fre. Rite		dates
142	First Tribune of C. Gracchus Scipionian Law	74	Second Mithridatic war Lucullus in command
	New status of the Tribunes distribution of cheap	73	Cilician (pirate) war of Marcus Antonius
	coin new colonies	72	Lucullus drives Mithridates back to Pontus
143	Gracchus Flaccus and L. Lucius Drusus (a national		Lucullus drives Mithridates from Pontus, and
	candidate) tribunes Drusus outbids Gracchus		reorganizes the province of Asia
	who fails for reelection Optimus consul		Murder of Marcus Pompey settles in Spain
	War continues in S. Gaul		Gladiolus revolt under Sertorius in Italy
144	Death of Gracchus slaughter of the Gracchians	71	Revolt broken by Crassus arrival of Pompey
	Victories in S. Gaul Gallia Narbonensis (Narbonne)	70	Consulate of Crassus and Pompey, hostile to the
	founded		Senate Birth of Verc.
145	Accession of Mithridates VI in Pontus	69	Advance of Lucullus in Armenia
146	Partition of Armenia between Jugurtha and the		Lucullus checked by unbroken nation of troops
	sons of Mithras	67	Lucullus forced to fall back
147	Commencement of Optimus for settlement of Numania		Pompey clears the Mediterranean of pirates
148	Teutonic invasion and Roman defeat in Italia	66	Pompey grants full powers in the East (Mithridates)
149	Jugurtha murders Adherbal Rome declares war		Livy drives Mithridates from Pontus
150	War suspended Jugurtha summoned to home		Rise of Julius Caesar as a democratic leader
	marriage Mithras there	65	Pompey settles Asia and goes to Syria
151	War renewed Albanus in Africa	64	Democratic experiments of C. Catiline at Rome
152	Mithras takes command in Africa		Pompey takes Jerusalem Syria's Roman Province
153	Mithras drives Jugurtha into Mauritania	63	Caeso commences defeat of Antioch's company
154	Marius elected consul super edict Metellus		Pompey completes his settlement of the East
	Gaul disaster to Roman force under Cassius at	62	Death of Catiline Pompey returns to Italy, but
	the hands of the Helvetii		drives him force
155	Bocchus of Mauritania surrenders Jugurtha to	61	Caesar praetor in Spain
	Sulla End of Jugurthin war death of	60	Caesar returns to Italy Informal coalition of Caesar,
	Jugurtha Birth of Cicero and Pompey		Pompey and Crassus (First Triumvirate)
156	Cimbri destroy a Roman force in the Rhenus	59	Caesar consul popular measure, C. given five
	valley but move on Spain instead of Italy		years proconsulship in the Gauls
157	Marius consul (1) army reforms	58	Caesar in Gaul defeats Helvetii and Ariovistus
158	Marius consul (2) second Sicilian slave war		Tribune of Clodius, Cicero exiled
159	Cimbri concert invasion with Teutones	57	Caesar in Gaul conquest of Belgae and Nervii
160	Marius consul (3) shatters Teutones at Aquae		Return of Cicero
	Sextiae	56	Conference of Imbrinium at Luca Caesar's cam
161	Marius consul (4) with Catulus shatters Cimbri at		paen against Veneti (Britanny)
	Vercellae (Campi Raudii) in Caspiae Gaul	55	Pompey given five years command in Spain,
	Sutrinum and Clitella at Rome		Crassus in Syria Caesar (extension) in Gaul
162	Marius consul (5) unites with Sertorius exil of	54	Caesar's first expedition on to Britain
	Metellus Numidicus Marius breeds with		Crassus goes to the East strained relations of
	Sertorius who is killed Victory of Senite		Caesar and Pompey second British expedi
163	Recall of Metellus ten years secretary of the	53	Crassus defeated and killed by Parthians at Carrhae
	Moderates End of the servile war		Caesar's trans-Euphrate campaign
164	Sulla praetor in Cilicia restores Antiochian	52	Disorders at Rome Clodius killed by Milo Pompey
	(expelled by Mithridates) in Cappadocia		made a consul
165	Tribunate and death of L. Lucius Drusus Minor		Gallie revolt of Vercingetorix
	Agreus of Lygriae of Armenia invited by	51	Conquest of Gaul completed
	Mithridates		I took my Aquiles succeeded by Ptolemy XII
	Union of Marius and other dissatisfied Socii, begin	50	Intrigues against Caesar
	ning at Social or Marsian war	49	Caesar crosses the Rubicon Pompey abandons
166	Roman commanders fail to press their successes		Italy Caesar secures Spain and returns to
	concessions to Italians Samnites over run		Italy
	Campagna	48	Battle of Pharsalus Pompey flight and death
167	Successes of Pompeius Strabo and Sulla genera		Caesar in the East I came I saw I conquered
	lmission of Italians except in Campania	47	Caesar's African campaign Thapsus
	Mithridates incites and supports Greek revolt	46	Caesar's Spanish campaign Munda
	Beheading of First Mithridatic war	45	Murder of Caesar (March) Arrival of Octavian
168	Sulla consul the tribune Sulpicus Rufus procures		Republican leaders withdraw to their pro
	vinces Antony attacks D. Brutus at Mutina	44	Octavian unites with Antony and Lepidus They
	the constitution and Sulla takes up the command		are appointed Triumvirs with full powers, for
	in Greece		five years Proscription of Republicans
169	Cimbri's invasion return of Marius the Marian	43	Death of Cicero
	marshes	42	Campaign and battle of Philippi
170	Marius consul (6) dies Sulla takes Athens and	41	An open campaign in the East and meets Cleopatra
	defeats Archelaus at Chalcis		Persian war in Italy
171	Sulla wins battle of Orchomenus	40	Irreconcilable union of Syria and Asia
172	Sulla makes peace with Mithridates and crushes		Reconciliation of Octavian and Antony, who
	himself Crassus (3) killed in mutiny		murders Octavian
173	Sulla with troops funds in Ital Sertorius goes to	39	Ventidius Bassus expels Parthians from Asia
	Spain to get a	37	Triumvirate renewed Sertius Pompeius commands
174	Sulla destroys Marian and Scipionian forces at the		the sea
	Crathine Gate	36-4	Agrippa defeats Sextus Lepidus deposed
	Sulla Dictator Proscription of Marians	35	Break between Antony and Octavian
175	Cornelius in a Roman Constitution deposed to	34	Antony expels Octavian War declared
	take the Senate supreme	33	Antony decisively defeated at Actium
		32	Death of Antony and Cleopatra

## Chronicle IX

# ROME'S EXPANSION AND HER RIVAL GENERALS: 133—31 B.C.

**T**HE year 133 B.C. is a conspicuous landmark in the world's history ; since in that year Rome for the first time became not merely a dominant political influence but an actual territorial power in Asia ; and in that year Tiberius Gracchus, all unconsciously, inaugurated the Roman Revolution. Another century had barely passed when the victory of Octavian's lieutenant Agrippa at Actium set the seal upon both the revolution and the expansion, making one man the master of the civilized world.

When the year 133 opened, even western Europe was far from being subjugated. Scipio was still engaged on the campaign which crushed the defiance of the far west. Transalpine Gaul was untouched. The heirs of Masinissa were disputing among themselves for the ascendancy in Africa, west of what had been the Carthaginian homeland and was now the Roman province of Africa. Egypt and all Asia were theoretically independent.

### Rome secures a Footing in the East

**A**N accident gave Rome the footing she had not chosen to claim before on the eastern continent. The king of Pergamum, Attalus III, died, leaving no son. The dynasty had been studiously—and profitably—loyal to Rome through all the shifting policies of the last seventy years ; and Attalus, dying, bequeathed his very flourishing kingdom to the Roman People. The Senate accepted the inheritance ; and though the inevitable pretender appeared and gave some trouble for a year or two, the Roman title was established without serious difficulty, though not without force.

Thus Rome became direct mistress of that half of Asia Minor (henceforth the Province of Asia) which roughly corresponded to the old-time kingdom of Lydia at its widest extent in the days of Croesus ; but Bithynia, Pontus (the realm of the house of Mithradates), Cappadocia and

Galatia still lay outside its bounds. Beyond them on the north-east was the kingdom of Armenia ; while the Parthian empire of the Arsacids had extended its borders westward as far as the river Tigris. The kingdom of the Seleucidae was going rapidly to pieces, the crown, like that of the Ptolemies in Egypt (after the death in 146 of the last creditable ruler of that name, Philometor) being not uncommonly worn as the precarious reward for the murder of the reigning king's predecessor.

### Organization of the Provinces

**T**HE expansion of the Roman power outside the Italian peninsula, except for the annexation of a part of the island of Sicily at the close of the First Punic War in 241, had been effected entirely during the last hundred years. The whole of this extra-Italian territory was now not in alliance with but subject to Rome, divided into provinces each under the rule of a Roman governor, a praetor, propraetor or proconsul (that is, a praetor or consul to whom at the end of his year of office his powers were extended for a further period, but only to be exercised within the province then assigned to him), whose imperium gave him command of the troops, irrespective of his military experience. Such extensions, it may be remarked, had first been instituted for consuls on foreign military service whose active command it had been felt advisable to prolong. Within Italy Cisalpine Gaul had been added to the number of the Provinces.

The rest of Italy was on a different footing. All the Italian communities had either been admitted to full Roman citizenship, with their members enrolled in the Roman Tribes ; or they were individually 'socii,' not Romans but allies, enjoying only treaty rights and subject to treaty obligations. Rome had been infinitely indebted to their services and their loyalty in the tremendous crisis of the Hannibalic



War as well as in numerous later campaigns, and there was among them a widespread sense of dissatisfaction at the inadequate recognition of her debt to them (see Chapter 62).

When Tiberius Gracchus procured election to the tribunate and started the revolution, he had probably no thought of subverting the constitution. His aim was economic. Long before, the plebeians who wanted office and social recognition had made common cause with their humbler brethren who merely wanted land. The political object had been achieved; the agrarian laws had soon become a dead letter, but the land-hunger had been satisfied by centuries of conquest, at the expense of the conquered. Now, however, the old trouble had once more become acute. The land did not support the peasantry; while the men of wealth had accumulated vast estates, especially in the more recently conquered territories, which they ran by slave labour. It was at least a tenable proposition that those estates had been acquired in actual violation of law, according to which the peasantry should have shared in them, and that the state had the right of resumption. Pasturage under slave labour paid the owners better than tillage under free labour, and the hideous-



#### ASIA MINOR WHEN ROME FIRST ENTERED IT

When in 133 B.C. Attalus III left his domains to Rome, by whom they were organized as the Province of Asia, the rest of Asia Minor was split up into this tangle of independent kingdoms. Mithradates I of Parthia (d. 138) had extended the Parthian Empire to the Tigris, and shortly afterwards it reached the Euphrates. For the rest of the Roman world, see map in p. 1688.

ness of slave labour as recently developed was just being very vividly illustrated in 133 by the terrible Servile War in Sicily, the slave rising which was threatening to give the island new masters.

Tiberius Gracchus (163-133 B.C.) had returned from Spain, indignant at the senatorial betrayal of Rome's honour by the repudiation of the Spanish treaty of Marcius. For projects of reform, which would touch their own wealth or power there was nothing to be hoped from the nobles, least of all for such a project as the resumption and redistribution of the lands in which they had acquired a prescriptive right, wherein he saw the remedy for the worst of the evils from which the state was suffering. But if the government was by constitutional practice in the hands of the Senate, the elected tribunes possessed by law powers intended to be exercised only on emergency by which they could force the hand of the government. Tiberius stood for the tribunate, and opened his campaign in 133.



#### BEST OF THE PTOLEMIES

Ptolemy VI Philometor (181-145 B.C.) was an intelligent prince and a brave soldier. His reign was disturbed by constant rivalry with his brother and successor, Ptolemy VII Euergetes, each of them in turn supported by Rome.

British Museum

## Rome's Expansion

He had prepared a bill to lay before the popular or tribal assembly, for resumption and redistribution, which his opponents denounced as sheer confiscation, though the technical right of resumption was confirmed by the most eminent legal authorities, including the consul, Mucius Scaevola, in Rome—Scipio was in Spain. But when the bill was brought in, another tribune, Octavius, interposed his veto. Gracchus replied by applying his veto to every sort of administrative action, revising his bill so as to make it more drastic than before, and again introducing it at the next assembly. There was no sort of doubt that it would pass, but again Octavius vetoed it. At the next assembly Gracchus moved that Octavius should be deposed from the tribunate. There was no precedent, but the motion was carried by the unanimous vote of the tribes. The agrarian law was then again introduced and, being similarly carried, became law.

But the deposition of Octavius was an act as palpably revolutionary as 'Pride's purge' or Cromwell's ejection of the Rump. As long as the popularity of the tribune ensured the support of the Assembly of tribes, he could carry any legislation he liked. But men began to discover that they might under the new law be deprived of land which they imagined themselves to

hold by an indefeasible title, and they took fright. It was becoming evident that Tiberius himself would be in danger the moment that he ceased to be protected from attack by the immunity conferred by his office, the person of a tribune being sacrosanct. He must procure re-election—and he might fail; there was no precedent for re-election without an interval. The proceedings were stayed over the day on which his office expired. On the following morning a party of hostile senators, led by his cousin Scipio Nasica, came down to the Assembly; a riot arose, and Tiberius was struck down and murdered. The murderers claimed that they had acted only as loyal citizens must act in the face of revolution. So it seemed even to Scipio Aemilianus, away in Spain—no lover of the existing order, but an unqualified opponent of revolutionary methods. And young Gaius Gracchus (153-121 B.C.), who was serving under him, held his peace; a silence more ominous than any hasty utterance.

**N**ASICA had to flee the country and died at Pergamum; on the other hand, the party of law and order punished some of the supporters of Gracchus by methods which were in fact positively illegal. Constitutionalists turned to Scipio, on his return from Numantia, as the man who



STRIKING A BARGAIN IN THE SLAVE MARKET

In the second century B.C. the conditions of the slave population under Roman mastery grew steadily more deplorable until discontent culminated in the Servile War. The specific traffic in human flesh is illustrated in this bas-relief on a funeral stela from Capua; it depicts a naked man standing on a stone pedestal between a Greek slave-dealer and a togated Roman who is purchasing him. It represents an actual incident in the life of one Satur, who happily rose from slavery to honourable freedom.

Musée Campano, Capua; from *Rostovtzeff, History of Ancient World; Rome*, Clarendon Press.

must save the state. No man could be more utterly relied upon to do what he conceived to be his duty without fear or favour; his instincts were intensely conservative; he was by no means blind to justly felt grievances; probably he was in sympathy with the real aims of Tiberius Gracchus, while detesting his methods. But the task needed a man of larger imagination and less rigid scrupulosity. One morning he was found dead in his bed, and the world believed that he had been murdered by the demagogues (129).

#### Political Programme of the Gracchi

THE agrarian law was being applied in a manner which created a fresh grievance among the allies; to counterbalance it, the Gracchans proposed to grant them the franchise, a measure distasteful alike to the already enrolled tribes and to the reactionaries. To be rid of Flaccus, the close personal friend and supporter of the murdered Tiberius, who proposed the measure, the Senate sent him off as consul to Transalpine Gaul to protect their allies of Massilia who had appealed for aid against the aggressive Celtic tribes. The result of his operations was conquest, annexation and the establishment of the Province of Gallia Narbonensis, which still bears the name of Provence; seventy years later it became the base of Julius Caesar's operations. While Flaccus was absent, Gaius Gracchus, who had been serving latterly as quaestor in Sardinia, returned to Rome to take the place and avenge the death of his brother; being now some thirty years of age. He was elected at once to the tribunate (123). Flaccus also now returned and celebrated a triumph for his Gallic victories.

The programme initiated by the younger Gracchus was wider in scope and much more far-reaching than that of his brother. The new Sempronian laws extended the operation of the agrarian law and supplemented it by planting new colonies: one was for the first time to be over sea, on the desolate and forbidden site of Carthage. A dangerous precedent was set by a measure for providing the city population with corn at half price, the first of a series of more or less open bribes

to the city voters. The next measures struck full at the power of the Senate. In the courts instituted for the trial of charges against provincial governors, the juries were composed of senators who even if honest were likely, and if dishonest were quite certain, to give judgement for the officials, members of their own order. For the Senate the law of Gracchus substituted members of the equestrian order, the wealthy commoners who were outside the senatorial body, and were virtually excluded from holding such appointments.

Gracchus did not, probably he could not legally, stand again for the tribunate; but the number of candidates being short, the tribes exercised their power, unquestionably legal in the circumstances, of re-electing him, together with his most prominent supporter Flaccus. But the nobles had put up a candidate of their own, Drusus, to outbid Gracchus in bribes for popular support. Drusus may have been honest enough himself, but the whole matter was an obvious political trick. He offered so much more than Gracchus that the tribune's popularity began to wane. Nor was his next measure calculated to restore it—a large extension of the franchise to the Italians, the scheme which had been held up by dispatching Flaccus to Gaul. Whatever the original intention may have been, the purpose was now clearly a unification of Italy much desired by the Italians, but not at all by most of the full Roman citizens. Drusus vetoed the bill, and added to his own popularity.

#### Gracchus' Fall from Power and Death

THEN the Senate, as before they had removed Flaccus by dispatching him to Gaul, removed both Flaccus and Gracchus by sending them to superintend the colonising of Carthage. By the time they were able to return their popularity had been completely undermined. Their bitterest enemy, Opimius, was elected consul, and both were rejected for the tribunate. Without the tribunician power they were helpless. Religious sentiment was excited by the portents reported from Carthage, profanely revived by them in spite of the solemn curse that had been


laid on the site only twenty-five years since. It became obvious that the fate of Tiberius was to be their fate also. The mob had turned against them, and respectable public opinion in panic was convinced that they were subverters of the state. Flaccus raised a handful of armed supporters; the forces of law and order, led by the consul Opimius, marched against them, and cut them to pieces. Gracchus died by the hand of a faithful slave, who slew himself on his loved master's corpse. Chapter 64 contains a study of the Gracchi and their aims.

For some twenty years after the fall of Gaius the revolution was in abeyance. The moderates, who predominated, shook their heads over the prevailing corruption, but were too politically timid to be active reformers. Reform slept, but before long the state was involved in wars which brought the need of it into glaring relief.

### Outbreak of the Jugurthine War

**I**N 118 the king of Numidia, Micipsa, last of the sons of Masinissa, died, leaving the crown to his two young sons Hiempsal and Adherbal, jointly with a much older bastard nephew, Jugurtha, who was an experienced soldier, able and ambitious. He procured the assassination of Hiempsal; Adherbal fled for his life, and appealed to the Senate. Jugurtha had no case, but he had gold, with which his agents reached Rome before Adherbal, whose appeal was received by the Senate with a strange coldness. A commission, however, was sent, with Opimius, the enemy of Gracchus, at its head, to divide the kingdom between the two claimants. It awarded the major and wealthy part of it to Jugurtha, and Opimius returned a richer man. Then Jugurtha murdered Adherbal.

Political morality was not dead in Rome. Hither Jugurtha was summoned and charged with his crimes before the Senate. The proceedings were stopped by the interposition of a tribune. So effective were Jugurtha's methods that even while he was in Rome he had another cousin murdered in the city. This was too much, but as he had come under safe-conduct he was only ordered to depart. 'A city for sale!' he sneered as he left.



A GREAT GENERAL

Gaius Marius, though born of humble parentage, achieved the unique distinction of being elected consul seven times. He rendered distinguished service in the Jugurthine and Social Wars, and further created the professional Roman army.

*Vatican Museum; photo, Alinari*

The Jugurthine war had already been declared in the previous year (111); it was not ended till 106. It was so ill managed that a commission of inquiry was held, which elicited such revelations that three ex-consuls, one being Opimius, retired into exile, and the incorruptible Quintus Metellus, one of several distinguished sons of Macedonicus, was sent out, with the low-born but equally incorruptible Gaius Marius (157-86), who had risen by sheer merit, as second in command, in 109.

**J**UGURTHA was a past-master in the arts of guerrilla warfare. Metellus was a good soldier who conducted his campaigns with skill and vigour, but Jugurtha held out. Marius, a better soldier than Metellus, returned to Rome to stand for the consulship, claiming that if the command were given to him the war would be ended at once. In fact, by the time he returned to Africa as consul to supersede Metellus, it appeared that Jugurtha was beaten. Metellus went home bitterly disappointed at having had his laurels snatched from him; but Jugurtha was not finished yet. Marius could not catch him, and he found a dubious ally or protector in his neighbour Bocchus, king of Mauretania. Finally it was the supreme audacity and diplomatic

skill of the quaestor Lucius Cornelius Sulla (138-78) that induced Bocchus to betray his protégé to the Romans and to a miserable death at Rome. But the conquest was credited to Marius.

Before the conqueror of Numidia was back in Rome (104) he was re-elected to the consulship for the ensuing year, though the law as it then stood forbade re-election and required the candidates to be present in Rome. He was the soldier of the hour, and the hour demanded a first-rate soldier commanding universal confidence. For during the Numidian war a tremendous menace had been gathering head on the northern frontiers of Italy. The Teutonic or German-speaking tribes were making their first appearance on the stage of definitely recorded history.

The advance hordes of the migrants, collectively known as Teutones and Cimbri (who were not, as we might be tempted to suppose, Celtic Cymri), threatened but were checked on the north-eastern frontier of Italy in 113; rolling west past the Swiss mountains they poured into Gaul, flooding down the valley of the Saône and Rhône and also setting in motion the Helvetii (Swiss) Celts. They defeated one Roman consul, Silanus, in 109; and in 107 another, Cassius, was trapped by the Helvetii and lost his army and his life. In 105 the forces of the proconsul Caepio and the consul Mallius were severally annihilated by the Cimbri, with the loss of more than 100,000 men. Then for no obvious reason the tide for a moment surged off elsewhere.

Rome, then, turned to account the breathing-space allowed her, by placing the control and reorganization of her armies in the hands of her one general,



SOLDIER AND STATESMAN TOO

Lucius Cornelius Sulla (138-78 B.C.) proved his brilliant military qualities in the Jugurthine, Teutonic, Social and Mithradatic Wars. He was appointed dictator in 82 B.C.

Chiaromonte Museum, Rome

making him consul year after year, regardless of rules framed not with military efficiency but with political stability in view. By new methods of recruiting and promotion and of rewarding service, Marius created a thing hitherto unknown in Italy—a professional army. By rigid training and discipline he brought it up to the highest standard of efficiency.

He was only just in time. In 103 the Germans were again massing on the Saône, with the intention of carrying out a double invasion of Italy—the plan which they developed next year—by way of the Maritime Alps on the west and of the north-eastern Alps; the Teutones taking the west and the

Cimbri the east. In 102 Marius, consul for the fourth time, annihilated the Teutones at Aquae

Sextiae in Transalpine Gaul, while his colleague, the aristocrat Catulus, kept guard in the Cisalpine province. In 101, when the Cimbri poured through the passes into the plain of the Po, they were in turn annihilated by Marius and Catulus at Campi Raudii near Vercellae. Sulla, who was present, recorded his opinion that the greater credit was due to Catulus, with whom Marius shared the triumph; popular opinion gave the whole of it to the man of the people, and elected Marius to his sixth consulship.

Marius the consul had himself insisted that Catulus the proconsul should share the triumph; but he was proud and the masses were proud of his humble origin. He was no politician, but he was inveigled easily enough by the demagogues, who saw a simple tool in the blunt old warrior, into serving their ends. His sixth consulship, not justified, like those preceding

it, by any public emergency, was their work. The leaders, Saturninus and Glaucia, set about violent measures directed against the senatorial party; measures popular among the Italians, who reckoned Marius as one of themselves, but unpopular in the city.

Marius found himself losing credit; the violent partisans on each side got the upper hand, while he wavered between them. Prominent men were or were believed to have been murdered by the other party; finally the city mob slew Saturninus and Glaucia, who had been among the most violent; and then in the reaction against violence it appeared for a time that the moderates would be in the ascendant. But the root causes of the unrest were untouched, since they lay in the corruption of society—of the high-born, of the wealth-seeking Equites and of the city mob—and in the real grievances of the allies; the former being repeatedly illustrated by the gross miscarriages of justice in the law-courts.

### Festering sore of Slavery

THE general brutalising of moral standards had been further illustrated also by a second slave revolt in Sicily. The first had been accompanied by savage atrocities on the part of the insurgents, and its suppression the year after the murder of Tiberius Gracchus had been marked by wholesale atrocities on the part of the government, when in one locality there were no fewer than twenty thousand crucifixions. Yet in 103 the slaves dared to revolt again—a sufficient demonstration of the hideous conditions under which they must have been living. It is not surprising that they fought so stubbornly that the revolt was only stamped out after a three years' struggle—during which, it is true, the resources of the state were being severely taxed by the Cimbrian war.

Then for nearly a decade after the sixth consulship of Marius, from 99 to 91, there

was a lull, followed by another decade of strife; the story of which is complicated by events in the East and then in the West which withdrew from or brought back to Italy at critical moments leading actors in the revolutionary drama, as actors also in the imperial expansion. The pivot of the Eastern affairs was Mithradates VI, king of Pontus (to be distinguished from the Parthian kings bearing the same name), a monarch of great abilities and yet greater ambitions, whose activities called for the intervention of Roman arms and Roman diplomacy; but the further account of the Mithradatic wars themselves must be postponed until after the narrative of the troubles in Italy.

THE two matters which mainly occupied the minds of politicians were the enfranchisement of the allies, and the friction occasioned by the rival desires of senators and equites, or knights, to dominate the political courts of justice; while to carry out any policy whatever it had become necessary to secure the suffrages of the voters in the Assembly of Tribes, who resented all attempts to admit the much more numerous allies to anything like an equal share in their privileges. In 91 the senatorial moderates allied themselves with Livius Drusus, the son of that Drusus who had been brought forward by the same party to outbid Gaius Gracchus for popular favour in 122. If the honesty of the father is open to doubt, that of the



### END OF THE JUGURTHINE WAR

References to recent history are frequent on coins of the Republican mint. Thus this coin, struck by Faustus Sulla, son of the Dictator, shows on the reverse the surrender of Jugurtha, the able but unscrupulous king of Numidia, to Sulla by Bocchus in 102 B.C. The obverse bears a head of Diana.

*British Museum*

son is not. As tribune he proposed to add to the Senate an equal number of the knights, to extend the franchise to the Italians, and to reward the humbler citizens for their assent by new schemes for colonisation and a further cheapening of corn for their benefit at the expense of the state. The populace, the senators and the knights each felt that they would be conceding too much and getting too little—and Drusus was assassinated.

#### Outbreak of the Social War

THE moderates had stood by Drusus loyally enough; but the opposition tribune now carried a bill declaring that to have supported franchise extension was treason. The excitement among the allies rose to fever heat; a Roman official was killed by an enraged mob at Asculum, the chief city of the Piceni, in central Italy; and from north to south the socii broke into open revolt, Marsi and Paeligni, Samnites, Lucanians, Apulians — eight nations in all. A federation was hastily formed with an emergency constitution; the Roman Senate declined to negotiate until compensation had been made for the outrage at Asculum; and the Social War (90-88) began.

Ill organized as they necessarily were, since the outbreak was unpremeditated, the socii put up a very valiant fight. A number of towns fell into their hands at the outset, and they cut up a consular army. Marius, taking the field again, defeated them, but—perhaps deliberately—made no effort to crush them.

They had a strong party of sympathisers in the Senate, who in 89 were able to win over waverers among the allies by the Julian law, granting the franchise to all who had not joined the insurrection. But the die-hards, especially the Samnites, only fought the harder, and on the other hand the death of one consul gave Sulla, who had been his lieutenant, the chance of showing his brilliant powers in the Samnite country; while the second consul, Pompeius Strabo, the father of a more famous son, conducted successful operations among the Piceni. By the end of the year resistance was maintained only in a few Samnite

and Lucanian strongholds; and the Senate, though Asculum and other places had been dealt with hardly, supplemented the Julian law of the previous year with the Lex Plantia-Papiria, which granted the franchise to all who laid down arms within sixty days. But the question as to whether the new citizens were to be enrolled as new additional tribes or distributed among the existing tribes remained unsettled.

At the beginning of 88, then, the Social War was ended, save for the garrisons which were still holding out; but the immediate dispatch of an army to the East was made necessary by the activities of Mithradates. Sulla, as consul elect, and as the man who had won the Social War, expected the command; but Marius wanted it. He found an ally in the eloquent tribune Sulpicius, who proposed that the new Italian citizens, who were quite certain to vote for Marius (always their friend), should be distributed among the tribes, whereby the Roman vote for Sulla would be swamped. The Marians organized a coup de main, appearing at the Assembly with concealed arms, and carried their point, not without bloodshed.

#### Sulla's sudden Coup de Main

BUT Sulla sped straight from the scene in Rome to his still undisbanded troops before Nola in Campania, where Samnites were still holding out, and appealed to them to follow him. The officers hesitated; the men did not; and the consul marched on Rome at the head of six Roman legions. He was joined by his colleague Pompeius Rufus; they seized the city gates, marched in, and routed the force collected by Marius. Marius and Sulpicius fled; the Senate, overawed, at the bidding of the consuls issued a decree of outlawry against the fugitives and ten of their followers, none protesting save a distinguished lawyer and leader of the moderates, Mucius Scaevola.

Sulpicius alone was betrayed by one of his slaves and slain. The old bulldog Marius—he was in his seventieth year—made a most adventurous escape from Sulla's bloodhounds to Africa and thence to Corsica. Sulla annulled the legislation

## Rome's Expansion

of Sulpicius, but could not prevent the election of Lucius Cornelius Cinna to the consulship in succession to Pompeius Rufus, who was murdered by the soldiery with the connivance of Pompeius Strabo, whom he had superseded; and then Sulla, threatened with a charge of treason for having led an army into the sacred precincts of the city, departed for the East with his troops, leaving Rome in the hands of Cinna, his declared enemy (87).

Four years (87-83) passed before Sulla thought fit to return from his extremely efficient campaigning and diplomatising in the East. During those years the revolution was rampant. Cinna revived the legislation and the methods of Sulpicius as champion of the Italians, and when his violence in the city was defeated by violence on the other side, he appealed as consul to the troops that had remained in Italy, and practically revived the Social War. Marius returned and joined him, more intent on vengeance than anything else. The senatorial commanders were inefficient or remained inactive of set purpose; the city had to open its gates to Marius and Cinna; and, in the week's reign of terror which followed, Marius wreaked his revenge on his enemies and on all whom he chose to reckon as enemies.

### Sulla reappears in Italy

**A**FTER the brief but hideous orgy of blood-lust which alarmed Cinna and disgusted the very notable Sabine Sertorius (c. 125-72), who had joined the anti-senatorial party, Marius seized his seventh consulship without election, but died a fortnight later (Jan., 87). Cinna remained master of Rome, and was continuously consul till he was killed in the course of a mutiny early in 84. But he made no notable use of his power, and Sulla was only waiting to put the finishing touches to his triumphant career in the East before returning to deal with the Italian situation after his own fashion as champion of the 'optimates' (as the oligarchic or senatorial party called themselves) against the 'populares' or democrats. In the spring of 83 Sulla landed in Italy with the army he had so often led to victory behind him. The forces at the disposal

of the government were far larger; but Sertorius was ere long on his way to Spain as praetor, and every day adherents flocked to the standard of the avenger.

Sulla as he marched through the country held his troops well in hand. He had not the smallest objection to shedding blood, except where policy suggested a meticulous clemency. He had come avowedly to punish the crimes of the Marians; and he was technically a rebel in arms at the head of rebel legions against the legally constituted government. The real tug-of-war came in 82, when the Samnites flung themselves whole-heartedly into what was now the struggle of the popular revolution against the reactionary revolution of Sulla. But the prolonged and desperate battle of the Colline Gate (Aug., 82) was decisive. It made Sulla the master of the Roman world.

### Sulla supreme as Dictator

**F**IFTY thousand men, dead or dying, were left on the field; eight thousand who were taken prisoners were three days later massacred in cold blood by Sulla's order. In Italy at least no further resistance was possible. The champion of the constitution was appointed dictator for so long as he might think fit to retain the office, in order that he might ensure the restoration of order. To that end he issued a series of proscriptions—lists of persons who had forfeited their property and their lives, including any one who was or might be obnoxious to himself or to any friend who had a grudge to be satisfied. If he chose to spare, he spared; and one of those whom he suffered to escape was a dissolute young patrician of eighteen, whose father's sister had been the wife of Marius, and who was himself the husband of Cinna's daughter—Gaius Julius Caesar.

Then he set the constitution in order; in such wise that the whole power of the state would be in the hands of the senators if they had the wit to use it. The tribunate and the Assembly of Tribes had been the instruments used by the democrats for the overthrow of the senate; tribunes were to be barred from all further office, and the Assembly was deprived of



the power of initiating legislation. The senatorial control of the courts was restored at the expense of the knights.

There were to be no more repeated consulships, like those of Marius and Cinna. Consuls were not to hold military commands till, after their year of office, they went abroad as proconsuls, when their powers could be exercised only in the particular province assigned to them. Such were the main features of the Sullan constitution of 81. Then in 79 the dictator discarded his powers and devoted the remaining months of his life to the debaucheries which carried him off in 78.

#### Affairs in the East: Mithradates of Pontus

**W**E must turn now to survey the affairs of the East during this half-century. Since the acquisition of Pergamum and its conversion into the Roman Province of Asia, the Empire in the East had been ruled by governors both of the best and of the worst type; but even the best could not prevent, though they might now and then succeed in punishing, the gross oppression to which the provincials were subjected by the system which farmed the taxes to wealthy Roman knights. When the knights and the governors leagued together the oppression was intensified, since the oppressors could secure the ear of the Roman court of appeal, whether it was composed of senators or knights or both. In such case the provincials had no redress and no means of resistance; and the sense of helpless resentment grew, while it could not take active form.

But outside the bounds of the Empire Mithradates VI (132-63), who had succeeded to the kingdom of Pontus in 120 at the age of twelve, set about the expansion and consolidation of his dominions, which he extended over the eastern littoral of the Euxine, known as Colchis, and to which he sought to add the semi-independent kingdoms of Cappadocia and Bithynia. In 99 he had withdrawn these pretensions at the bidding of Rome, just released from the Teutonic menace; he



**MITHRADATES VI**

Mithradates VI, king of Pontus, 120-63 B.C., waged three separate wars with Rome, ended only by his suicide after his defeat by Pompey. *From Ward, 'Greek Coins'*

renewed them and again withdrew them in 92 at the bidding of Sulla, who had been sent as governor to Cilicia. When the Social War broke out, however, Sulla was back in Italy, and Rome was very fully occupied, so Mithradates invaded the Roman Province of Asia, which welcomed a deliverer from the Roman tyranny. He successfully overran it, captured and put to death its detested governor Aquillus, and ordered a general massacre of Italians, to the number of 80,000. Half

Achænae, Athens taking the lead, followed the example of Asia, and rose against its Roman rulers, supported by the king and troops of the king of Pontus. Such was the situation when in 87 Sulla carried his army from Italy to Greece, leaving Rome in the hands of Cinna.

Athens was the centre of resistance in Greece. Its fortifications, and those of the Piræus against which Sulla directed his main attack, defied all the efforts of his engineers, while his lieutenant Lucius Lucullus was raising a fleet to deprive Mithradates of his command of the Aegean. Early in 86, however, Athens was starved out, and the port soon afterwards surrendered. Both paid a heavy penalty. But Archelaus, the ablest officer of Mithradates, had now assembled a large army in Thessaly. Sulla, with no more than a sixth of his numbers, shattered his force on the old battlefield of Chaeronea.

A Roman consul, Valerius Flaccus, with his lieutenant Fimbria and fresh forces, was in Epirus, on the way to supersede Sulla, who had no intention of being superseded. While he was on his way north to deal with Flaccus, huge reinforcements arrived from Asia for Archelaus. Sulla promptly wheeled southward, and repeated at Orchomenus the triumph of Chaeronea. Meanwhile Flaccus, avoiding a conflict with Sulla, was hastening to the Hellespont to fight Mithradates in Asia; but Fimbria, with schemes of his own, made away with his chief, assumed the command himself, and crossing the strait started operations on his own account.

## Rome's Expansion

Sulla opened negotiations with the defeated Archelaus, who was disposed to peace on the terms of a return to the pre-war position, the more because Lucullus was now master of the sea. A conference was arranged between Sulla and the king, and a treaty was struck by which Mithradates was to surrender his conquests, to hand over seventy ships and to pay an indemnity (85).

It remained to settle with Fimbria, who committed suicide when he found himself deserted by his troops on Sulla's approach; and thus in 84 Sulla was able to return to Italy to carry through the revolution already described, leaving the settlement of the East in the very competent hands of Lucullus, who dealt with the sorely pressed provincials as gently as his instructions permitted. The command, however, passed on to another of Sulla's lieutenants, Murena, who before the dictator's resignation attacked Mithradates again, and was allowed a triumph; though the war was promptly stopped by orders from Rome.

Two men had risen to prominence as supporters of Sulla. One was Publius Licinius Crassus (117-53), to whom the victory of the Colline Gate was largely due; the other, Gnaeus Pompeius (106-48)—Pompey—the young son of Pompeius Strabo. Youthful though he was, Pompey had shown remarkable military talents, which induced Sulla to entrust him with the suppression of the Marians in Africa; whereby he won from the dictator the complimentary title of Magnus, 'the Great.' Crassus had no little ability, but he chose to concentrate it on the acquisition of wealth, with power as a subsidiary aim.

Sulla was hardly dead when the inevitable attempt to overturn his

constitution was made by the consul Lepidus, posing as champion of the popular party. When he took up arms, however, he was easily crushed (77).

**I**N one quarter, the Marians had not been suppressed. Sertorius, as we saw, retreated to Spain when Sulla returned to Italy, and there he was making himself a formidable power, partly as the real representative of Rome—that is, of the old government—partly by rallying the Spaniards to his own standard as their leader. He was very much more than a match for the Roman forces sent to deal with him. Pompey, charged with the business in 77, fared not much better than his predecessors; and presently Mithradates—resentful of Murena's attack and no longer in awe of Sulla—was negotiating with Sertorius, with the intention of renewing the war in 74. The alliance in fact came to naught, because Sertorius was assassinated in 72—not with any connivance on the part of Pompey, though very conveniently for him; since when the great leader was gone, the suppression of what remained of Marianism in Spain presented no serious difficulties. He returned to Italy to claim and receive credit, for having succeeded where others had failed.

By this time the Third or Great Mithradatic war was already in full swing in the East, and a third slave-rising, this time in Italy itself, was receiving its death-blow. Slaves were trained as gladiators; and in 73 such a one, a Thracian named Spartacus, broke away with seventy comrades from the 'school' at Capua and took refuge in the hills. The numbers of his band swelled rapidly; for months he kept his men well in hand under strict discipline, and routed two com-



**POMPEY THE GREAT**

Gnaeus Pompeius, known as Pompey (106-48 B.C.), won glory in Africa, Spain, and in the East. Thereafter his influence declined and he was defeated by Caesar at Pharsalus.  
*Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen*



#### TIGRANES THE GREAT

Tigranes I, king of Armenia 95-55 B.C., greatly extended his dominions, annexing Syria among other regions. This fact explains the Genius of Antioch with Orontes at her feet (see also page 1416) on the reverse of this silver coin.

*From Ward, 'Greek Coins,' John Murray*

manders who were sent to take him. In 72 he had so formidable a host at his back that two consular armies were sent against him, and he routed them both.

Pompey was away in the West, Lucullus in the East. It was Crassus who at the head of six legions at last brought Spartacus to bay, shattered his army, and slew him on the field (71). Five thousand of the gladiatorial soldiery cut their way through, but only to be blotted out by the forces of Pompey, just back from Spain. To his Spanish laurels Pompey added those which were justly due to Crassus. Crassus, seeing that the popular soldier might be useful to him, did not quarrel: Pompey and he together could clearly do what they chose.

THEY chose, in fact, to undermine the foundations of the Sullan constitution. Both by its terms were barred from standing for the consulship, Pompey by his youth, Crassus because the law required an interval between the consulship and the praetorship which he then held; but both stood and were elected. As consuls, during 70, they procured the annulment of the disabilities imposed on the tribunate by the Cornelian laws, thereby restoring also the lost legislative powers of the Tribal Assembly; and another law gave a new constitution to the Courts—which became one-third equestrian and one-third senatorial, while the remaining third was selected by certain elected officers. They had won the first point because the Senate dared not refuse the demand, however unconstitutional, of two successful generals, each with an army behind him.

Meanwhile, the developments in the East had produced a situation for dealing with which some quite unprecedented step was becoming imperative. In this situation there were two factors, the war with Mithradates and the Cilician pirate fleets which infested the Mediterranean.

When Sulla the invincible disappeared from the stage, Mithradates was on the alert for a chance of reviving his project of an Asiatic empire. The opportunity came in 74, when Nicomedes of Bithynia died and, like Attalus, left his kingdom to the Roman people. Mithradates put up a pretender on whose behalf he invaded Bithynia. The consul Cotta could make no head against the king; but Lucius Lucullus, formerly the very able lieutenant of Sulla in the East, where he had won the good will of the Asiatics; was dispatched to be governor of Cilicia and to deal with Mithradates.

#### Fluctuating Progress of the War

THOUGH provided only with a comparatively small and undisciplined force, Lucullus conducted his operations with such skill that within the year he had broken up the army of Mithradates without having had to fight a pitched battle, and driven the king into his own territory. By a series of campaigns during the following years Mithradates was compelled to flee to Tigranes of Armenia. Lucullus, having subjugated Pontus, proceeded to a general settlement of Asia Minor, to the great satisfaction of the population and the corresponding annoyance of the soldiery and the tax-farmers, whose depredations he firmly repressed. In 69 he advanced against Tigranes, who had scornfully refused his demand for the surrender of Mithradates, captured his capital, Tigranocerta, and in the next year routed his forces. But then Lucullus found himself paralysed by the mutinous spirit of his own troops, and was forced (67) to withdraw to Pontus, where Mithradates had reappeared; there Lucullus learnt that he himself was to be superseded.

While Lucullus was pursuing his victorious career, the Cilician pirates were successfully defying the naval power of Rome. Matters came to something like

## Rome's Expansion

a climax in 74. In that year Marcus Antonius, son of a famous orator and father of the still more famous Mark Antony, was given a special commission for their suppression and failed disgracefully. After his death, indeed, matters were improved, when the consul Quintus Metellus was sent out in 69; but Pompey had now decided that the task was eminently suitable for himself. In 67 a measure proposed by the tribune Gabinius in the teeth of senatorial opposition, but supported by Caesar, who was now making himself the rising hope of the old Marians, gave Pompey an almost unlimited command in the Mediterranean.

A commander with a perfectly free hand and control of unrestricted resources was what the situation required. In three months Pompey accomplished what no half-hearted measures could have effected. He spread his fleets across the Mediterranean and swept it clean from end to end. The pirates were destroyed.

Not so Mithradates or his ally Tigranes: the generalship and the statesmanship of Lucullus were fully equal to the task, but they were foiled by a mutinous soldiery and the hostility of the Roman moneyed interest. By popular acclamation Pompey, fresh from his brilliant triumph over the pirates, was given supreme and unlimited authority over the whole East, to be retained until he himself should be satisfied with the completeness of the settlement he might effect. Such powers had never before been bestowed on any man save Sulla. Senatorial constitutionalists might shake anxious heads, but the tide of Pompey's popularity was irresistible. From 66 to 62 the East absorbed him.

### Pompey takes Command in the East

**I**N his first campaign Pompey forced Mithradates to fight him, and routed him on the eastern border of Pontus, whence the king, refused an asylum by Tigranes, escaped to the northern shores of the Black Sea. There, out of reach of the Roman, he busied himself with a grand scheme of invading Italy at the head of the barbarian tribes of eastern Europe. That project, however, was brought to naught by the revolt of his son Pharnaces,

and in 63, broken at last in his old age. Mithradates died by his own hand.

Pompey, on defeating Mithradates, left the fugitive king to his own devices while he secured the conquered territory from external attack. In this there was little difficulty. Tigranes had already suffered so severely at the hands of Lucullus that he had withdrawn his countenance from Mithradates and his troops from Syria, to which he had recently extended his sovereignty. When Pompey marched into Armenia, the king made haste to offer abject submission. The Roman graciously confirmed him in the possession of his kingdom—limited however to Armenia proper—and accepted friendly overtures from Phraates of Parthia, who had now assumed the old title King of Kings.

### Reorganization of Asia Minor and Syria

**R**ETURNING to Pontus, Pompey saw that nothing was to be gained by attempting to hunt down Mithradates beyond the Caucasus, and so ended his first triumphant year devoted to the organization of Asia Minor. Pontus was transformed into a Roman province, with Bithynia, and the province of Cilicia was enlarged. The minor principalities on the border, Cappadocia, Galatia and Commagene, were recognized as being under Roman protection. The second year was spent in bringing this work to completion, and in 64 Pompey turned his attention to Syria.

During the last sixty years the once mighty kingdom of the Seleucids had gone utterly to wreck. Parthia had already absorbed Media and Persia. A Jewish kingdom was established under the Levitical Hasmonaeen dynasty, with an Idumean (Edomite) kingdom to the south of it, in the north-west of Arabia. Claimants, legitimate or otherwise, to the crown of the Seleucids wrangled and deposed and assassinated each other in lurid succession till in 84 Tigranes of Armenia fell upon the distracted land and annexed it. A few years later the Roman menace to his own land made him retire from it again. Syria lay at the feet of the conqueror of Mithradates and Tigranes.

Syria had everything to gain and nothing to lose from the setting up of an

efficient authority. When in 64 Pompey descended from Cappadocia upon the ancient Land of the Amorites, he only needed, so far as the whole northern region was concerned, to assume the sovereignty on behalf of Rome, and to give it the organization of a Roman province. On the other hand, the Hasmonaeen princes of Judaea had been admitted to the alliance and occasional protection of Rome for



ARISTOBULUS IN DEFEAT

'Bacchus the Jew,' named on the reverse of this coin, is Aristobulus, the prince of Judaea, who in 63 B.C. resisted Pompey's arbitration in favour of his brother Hyrcanus. He is represented making submission to Pompey.

*British Museum*

half a century, and there was no immediate warrant for annexation. The Jews themselves provided the justification.

As always, there were two parties among the Jews; the rigidly orthodox and the latitudinarians, who leaned to the learning and the customs of the gentiles. The Maccabees had been the heroic champions of the former; but since they had become princes as well as priests, political rather than religious considerations had guided the various rival members of the family in seeking the support of one party or the other. The government was generally in the hands of those who stood for puritanism and isolation, while the other side was commonly the more popular.

At this time (63) the supremacy was in dispute between two brothers, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, and appeal was made to Pompey to arbitrate between them. Pompey's award was in favour of Hyrcanus, and the puritans; but the followers of Aristobulus in Jerusalem rejected alien dictation. Consequently, Jerusalem underwent a stubbornly contested siege; and when at last the conqueror entered it, he left Hyrcanus in possession, but as a tributary of Rome. Judaea was

made a division of the province of Syria. Pompey had in effect extended the empire of the Roman Republic to the Euphrates. He passed the time between the fall of Jerusalem and his slow return to Italy late in the next year (62) in completing the organization of the new provinces—without consulting the Senate. Mithradates being dead, Pharnaces his son was left to reign in his stead in the European realm north of the Euxine.

During the five years of Pompey's absence in the East the government at Rome had passed through a grave crisis. Caesar, the nephew of Marius and the son-in-law of Cinna, was systematically and even audaciously courting popularity, while he was far too cool-headed to commit himself to any of the schemes of subversive violence that might be developed by the hot-heads of the anti-senatorial party. Among these hot-heads was Lucius Sergius Catilina (Catiline—c. 106-62) a profligate patrician, who was reputed at least to have no scruples in such matters as assassination, but was undoubtedly possessed of the virtues of courage and loyalty to his associates.

#### Cicero champions the Senatorial Party

ON the other hand the ranks of the senatorial party were joined by the most brilliant orator of the day, Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43), a 'new man' to whom the exclusive optimates were by no means eager to extend a welcome. He had distinguished himself, too, by his attack on Verres, who as praetor in Sicily had been guilty of many enormities, and by his panegyric on Pompey—no favourite with the senatorial class—when the Manilian law gave him his Eastern command. But democracy frightened him, and his panacea for the diseases of the state was alliance between the optimates and the knights, the body from which he as well as Pompey derived, as the forces of law and order against veiled or open revolutionaries. Both groups had at least a common interest in the preservation of stable government and the rights of property. And these were threatened by Catiline, who in 64 was a candidate for the consulship of the ensuing year, having

## Rome's Expansion

just been barely acquitted on a charge of treasonable conspiracy. To save so dangerous a situation, the optimates adopted the popular orator as their candidate, and Catiline was defeated.

Then, if not before, Catiline definitely planned revolution; while Caesar occupied himself with measures certain to enhance his own popularity, whether they were carried or not, and to diminish that of the consul who, having now definitely attached himself to the optimates, was bound to oppose them. Caesar's unwelcome success was demonstrated by his election to the dignified office of Pontifex Maximus over the heads of the most eminent senatorial candidates.

### Defeat of the Catiline Conspiracy

**B**UT the great event of the year (63) was Catiline's conspiracy and its defeat. The intrigue was afoot, but on the one hand Catiline did not mean to move until he had attained the consulship, and on the other Cicero had unsuspected confederates in the conspirators' camp. Neither, in fact, felt ready to strike till, near the end of the year, the information in Cicero's hands warranted him in laying a statement before the Senate. Catiline, again defeated in the consular election, slipped away to the north to head the intended insurrection in the provinces, leaving his accomplices to carry out the programme arranged for the city.

A treasonable correspondence between him and the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges fell into the hands of the consul, who was endowed with emergency powers; the principal conspirators were surprised and arrested; and from some of them confession of their sanguinary intentions was extracted. The prisoners were condemned to death by decree, without trial—on the legal plea that they were not citizens whom it was illegal to put to death without sanction of the Tribal Assembly, but public enemies. Cicero told the whole story to the multitude gathered in the Forum amid frantic applause, and ever after regarded himself as the acknowledged saviour of Rome.

There, in fact, the insurrection had been throttled at birth; but in the country

Catiline and his principal lieutenant fell fighting indomitably at the head of the troops they had succeeded in raising. For the moment at least the spectre of revolution was laid. Caesar as the constitutional leader of the democrats denounced the unconstitutional execution of the prisoners, but it was quite impossible to bring home to him any charge of complicity in the conspiracy, while his popularity with the mob and the senatorial mistrust of him were increased.

Catiline fell early in 62. Pompey was on the point of returning with his laurels and his legions from the East. No one knew what he intended to do, and every man knew that he could do whatever he chose; but he gave no sign. Both Caesar and Cicero wanted his alliance; but Caesar knew how to wait and turn events to his own account. At present Crassus



### ROME'S GREATEST ORATOR

Famous as a pleader in the law courts, Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 B.C.) was successively quaestor, aedile, praetor and, in 63 B.C., consul. He abjured politics after Pompey's defeat at Pharsalus and devoted himself to literature.

*Apoley House Collection, permission of Duke of Wellington*



Busts and portrait statues equally testify to the commanding intellect and character of Julius Caesar, who furnishes an example of greatness as orator, man of letters, soldier and statesman unexcelled in history.

*British Museum; photo, Fleming*



Gaius Julius Caesar was born in Rome, July 12, 102 B.C., of patrician rank. Allying himself with the democratic party he became quaestor in Spain, praetor and, in 59, consul. His military triumphs while governor of Gaul provoked enmity at home, which resulted in the Civil War. After routing Pompey at Pharsalus in August, 48, Caesar attained supreme power, ended by his assassination March 15, 44 B.C. The statue (right) admirably portrays him as one of the world's greatest captains.

#### HOW ROMAN SCULPTORS EXPRESSED THE GREATNESS OF JULIUS CAESAR

*Naples Museum and Capitoline Museum, Rome; photos, Alinari and Anderson*

with his gold was more important than Pompey with his men; the money of Crassus enabled Caesar to take up the propraetorship in Spain, soon after Pompey's landing at Brundisium.

The anxiety caused by Pompey's approach was intensified by the proposal of one of his partisans that he should be invested with the supreme command in Italy because of the disturbed state of the country; actually this was vetoed, but not till Caesar had taken the opportunity to commend it. Constitutionalists, however, took comfort when the returned general instead of remaining in arms dismissed his troops. He was not minded to play the part of a Sulla or a Marius; but what part he did mean to play was, and remained, an open question. Caesar having left the field clear, the optimates should have been able to secure Pompey; but Cicero's combination of irrepressible vanity with ostentatious devotion annoyed him; the Senate withheld ratification of the arrangements he had made in the East without consulting them; and the opportunity was lost.

In 60 Caesar returned from Spain, enriched by the spoils of successful campaigns against insurgent tribes, to stand for the consulship. The temper in which he found Pompey made it easy for him by an exercise of his diplomatic astuteness to secure the alliance of the general and to reconcile him with the useful Crassus. The partnership was to be sealed next year by the marriage of Pompey to Caesar's daughter Julia. With Pompey and Crassus supporting him, Caesar was triumphantly elected consul.

### First Consulate of Julius Caesar

**H**E used his year of office (59) to establish his position. An agrarian law, obstinately opposed in the Senate, but openly supported by Pompey and Crassus, was carried in the Assembly. The knights, whom Cicero thirsted to unite with the optimates, were detached by the relaxation—opposed by the latter—of the terms of their contract for the farming of taxes in Asia. The acts of Pompey in the East were ratified. And finally Caesar procured for himself, for the unprecedented term of

five years, the proconsulship of Cisalpine Gaul and Illyricum; to which the Senate, hoping to be well rid of him, added Transalpine Gaul, where serious trouble was threatening.


Before departing for his province in 58 Caesar arranged to leave the optimates without a leader, by dispatching the austere and uncompromising Cato 'of Utica' (95-46) to effect the annexation of Cyprus, and by enabling the profligate Publius Claudius, better known as Clodius, who had a violent grudge against Cicero, to obtain the tribunate. The orator, attacked for the illegal execution of Roman citizens in his consulate, was obliged to go into exile in Greece.

### Disorder in the Capital

**F**OR a time Clodius exercised his powers unchecked, since neither Pompey nor Crassus chose to interfere; among his measures was one that ensured the distribution of corn not even at half price but gratis to the populace. But the reckless violence of his conduct lost him the countenance of Pompey, who next year (57) showed his displeasure by procuring the recall of Cicero; a measure which Clodius and his associates opposed by riotous force, which was met and defeated by the equally lawless violence of the senatorial tribune Milo Cicero, who on his return found himself surprisingly popular, had nothing better to propose than that Pompey should be invested with dictatorial powers for the restoration of order; which might have been useful had Pompey had any clear idea as to what he should do with them, or if the senatorial reactionaries had been better disposed towards Pompey himself, his backer Crassus, and his absent associate Caesar. The full powers were not conveyed to him, and of those he did receive he made no effective use.

Clodius was indeed held in check, but, beyond that, a senatorial reaction was clearly threatening; very dangerous to the interests of Caesar, who in the intervals of his Gallic campaigns was keeping keen watch on affairs at the capital. In 56, when he was in Cisalpine Gaul, he held a conference with his two allies at Lucca; the result of which was that Pompey and





#### EXPLOITS OF CAESAR IN THE 'THREE GAULS'

Caesar's military energy can be gauged by the number of his battles in Gaul. His division of Transalpine Gaul, other than Narbonensis, into three parts—Aquitania, Celtica and Belgica—was recognized by Augustus when, with some alterations of boundaries, he made of it three provinces.

Crassus stood for the consulship against a senatorial candidate, and were elected mainly because the son of Crassus, who had been serving brilliantly under Caesar, was at no great distance from Rome with a returning legion.

It did not suit Caesar to return to Rome at this stage. To secure the control of the situation for himself and his associates, Pompey procured the extension of Caesar's proconsulship for a further term of five years (till the end of 49); Crassus received the Eastern command against the Parthians, who were pushing across the Euphrates into Roman territory, since he wanted military honours to counterbalance those which Pompey had won and Caesar was winning; and for himself Pompey obtained the proconsulship of Spain, though he intended to discharge the duties of that office by deputy, while he himself remained at Rome in effective control. These also were appointments for five years. The powers of these three colleagues, unofficially known as the First Triumvirate, were irresistible.

But in the ensuing years Caesar was kept at a distance by the Gallic campaigns which demanded all his energies. In 54 Pompey's young wife died and with her death disappeared the personal link that had bound him so closely to his father-in-law. Crassus started for the East; but only to meet his death next year (53) at the hands of a foe whom Rome was destined never to subdue, in the terrible military disaster of Carrhae in north Mesopotamia, where the Roman army was almost destroyed by the Parthians. And Pompey, remaining in or near Rome, did nothing. Only he watched with growing jealousy the successive triumphs of Caesar in Gaul. Even the ordinary routine of government was thrown out of gear by the tribunes of either party, who vied with each other in suspending elections to the magistracies.

In 52 matters seemed to have come to a head. Clodius, still the leader of the popular extremists, was killed in an affray with the followers of Milo, the leader of the senatorial extremists. Cicero wished but did not dare to defend Milo publicly; Pompey did not choose to protect him, and he had to take flight. Pompey, commissioned to restore order and elected sole consul, was virtually dictator; but his official dictatorship might have involved an immediate collision with Caesar. What he actually did made a hardly less definite breach between them. While he procured a five years' extension of his own Spanish proconsulship, he had a law passed under which Caesar's successor might take his place nearly a year earlier, in March, 49, instead of January, 48, according to the previous arrangement, and consular candidates must be present at their election; though a special decree exempted Caesar from this latter condition. For the moment Caesar was paralysed by a sudden revolt in Gaul on a very large scale.

## Rome's Expansion

We must now turn to Caesar's own career during these years of his Gallic command.

In the first year of his governorship, 58, Caesar's powers had been put to the proof. Hitherto, though his youth had not been without military experience, his abilities as a general had been tested only in Spain. His presence was now urgently required in Gaul—Transalpine Gaul—because of the movement among the Teutonic tribes on the east of the Rhine and their pressure on the Helvetic (Swiss) Celts. It was doubtless in consequence of this pressure that the Helvetii determined to migrate eastwards in a vast body and establish themselves in new pastures. That would mean a general upheaval in Gaul, and a serious threat to the Roman province. The year 58 was therefore at first occupied with a campaign in which the invaders were split in two and their forces so heavily defeated that they had to retire to their own mountains.

But this only brought into relief the German menace which had been scotched by the great victories of Marius at Aquae Sextiae and Campi Raudii between forty and fifty years earlier. German tribes (Suevi, Swabians) were over the Rhine, threatening to subjugate the Aedui, the Gallic allies of Rome on the northern borders of the Province; their chief, Ariovistus, having in mind a partition of Gaul between himself and the Romans. Caesar led his legions to the help of the Aedui, inspired with his own audacity the men who were on the verge of panic, since the German warriors had a terrifying reputation, and utterly routed Ariovistus, who barely escaped across the Rhine with a remnant of his forces.

### Victory over the Nervii

**T**HE Germans were driven back, but the victory aroused all over Gaul the fear that a general conquest was impending. The Roman approach was especially resented by the Nervii, the leading tribes of the warlike Belgae of the north-east, who had hitherto refused intercourse with the southern people. Caesar, warned by friendly Gauls that an attack was to be expected, struck first, invading Nervian territory in 57. The Nervii fought heroic-

ally; there was a moment in the decisive battle when only the personal leadership of Caesar saved the Roman army from annihilation; but the actual victory was overwhelming, and was followed by a general submission of the tribes between the Aisne and the Rhine. 'The day he overcame the Nervii' was celebrated in Rome by a prolonged public festival.

The alarm of the Belgae, however, had been thoroughly warranted; for during the next year, 56, Caesar, after his conference at Lucca with Pompey and Crassus, reduced the whole of Gaul to submission in the course of three campaigns—justified, of course, by aggressive movements among the barbarians—conducted either by himself or his lieutenants in the north-east, the south-west and Armorica (Brittany).

The two following years were occupied with expeditions and campaigns of an experimental kind. In 55 a fresh irruption of Germans across the middle Rhine was completely shattered in the neighbourhood of the modern Coblenz—a pretext having been found for detaining their chiefs, who had been invited to a conference—and the victory was followed by a great raid over the river into German territory, which made Caesar decide that the Rhine should remain the boundary.

### Caesar invades Britain

**A**N enemy of the Romans acting as Caesar had done would have been denounced for treachery, and in Rome Cato did not hesitate to denounce the proconsul; though without effect, as there had as yet been no breach between Caesar and Pompey. Afterwards, Caesar made his first exploring expedition to Britain, a land hitherto known only by report of mercantile travellers. In 54, when Crassus was on his way to the East, Caesar made the second British expedition, and reduced the south-east of the island to submission, but decided that a real conquest was not worth undertaking, for the present at least.

In that winter and in 53, the year of the disaster of Carrhae, Caesar was occupied with the suppression of ominous insurrections in north-eastern Gaul; and then, in 52, just when Pompey's jealousy was at its height, a great war of liberation was



TRIUMPHAL ARCH AT ORANGE

One of the earliest examples of the Roman triumphal arch, this splendid structure was erected at Orange, not far from Avignon, about 46 B.C. to commemorate Caesar's conquest of Massilia and the reduction of Gaul to submission.

*Photo, Munsell*


organized in the very heart of Gaul by the heroic Arvernian chief Vercingetorix.

So stubborn and so able was the Gallic chief that all Caesar's energies were required for the campaign before the centre of resistance was broken and Vercingetorix himself captured; and the whole of 51 was fully occupied with the military organization and the establishment of the garrisons needed for the effective reten-

tion of Caesar's conquests, which were said to have been accomplished at the cost of more than a million Gallic and German lives. Meanwhile the party in Rome most hostile to him was straining itself to the utmost to effect his destruction between the termination of his present appointment and his entry upon new powers.

Caesar would be secure from attack if he passed straight from his proconsulship to a new consulship, to which he was secure of election, but on which he could not enter till 48. If he could be deprived of his troops before that date, he would be indicted for his questionable proceedings in Gaul, and his fate would be sealed, while Pompey with his prolonged command would still have the disposal of his own troops. Pompey's jealous fears forced him at last into definite alliance with the optimates. In 51 Caesar's agents in Rome delayed a decree which would have displaced him in March, 49, but the proposal was only deferred, and meanwhile two legions were detached from him, but retained in Italy, to be ready for service against the Parthians in the East.

In the spring of 50 the question of redistributing the provinces—authorised by the legislation of 52—came up again for settlement. Caesar's agents in Rome proposed compromises: that he and Pompey should resign simultaneously, or that he should retain one only of his three



SHOCK OF BATTLE BETWEEN ROMAN AND GAUL

The bas-reliefs on the triumphal arch at Orange furnish much detailed information as to the armour, including large oblong shields and horned helmets, and the weapons used by the Gauls in Provence in the first century B.C. On the north and south fronts are animated pictures of the Romans and Barbarians in the shock of conflict, from which we learn that the Gauls fought naked except for the 'sagum,' a coarse woollen blanket worn plaid-wise over the shoulder.

*From Carlisle, 'Monuments antiques à Orange'*

## Rome's Expansion

provinces. Pompey refused, but proposed that Caesar should not resign till November, 49; which would still leave two months for his prosecution and overthrow. Caesar refused; and, having completed the settlement of Farther Gaul, he was now in Cisalpine Gaul with one veteran legion. Pompey, commissioned by the Senate, left Rome to raise more troops in Italy. In January, 49, Caesar repeated his offer of a joint resignation; the Senate again rejected it, and replied with a decree giving a free hand 'for the defence of the Republic' to the consuls for the current year, both senatorials.

Caesar was still in his province, of which the boundary was the river Rubicon, with his veterans behind him. The momentous choice was before him; he must submit and suffer his enemies utterly to destroy him, or strike for empire. He made his choice. At the head of his one legion, on the night of January 6, 49, he crossed the Rubicon—an act of open rebellion against the government.

### Rupture between Pompey and Caesar

**P**OMPEY was not prepared for the sudden swiftness of his adversary. Without waiting for the reinforcements which he forthwith summoned from Farther Gaul, Caesar swooped on Umbria and Picenum, which were not prepared to resist. Town after town yielded, and having yielded was won over to his side by his politic clemency and the firm control under which he kept his soldiery. In six weeks he was before Corfinium, where he was joined by another legion from Gaul; Corfinium was surrendered by the soldiery and he sped south in pursuit of Pompey. For the legions that Pompey had ready were those which had been led to victory after victory in Gaul by Caesar himself. Pompey had, therefore, already made up his mind to abandon Italy and raise in the East the forces which were to overwhelm the rebel, and he with all his troops embarked at Brundisium, which he had reached before Caesar could come up with him.

Caesar, thus balked, was back in Rome, with no foe to fight in Italy, within three months of the crossing of the Rubicon, and with all the ordinary machinery of

government suspended. He secured the sinews of war by seizing the treasury, and before setting out in pursuit of Pompey turned west, to deal with Spain and put the Pompeian legions there out of action. Not so much by fighting as by skilful manoeuvring, in which however Caesar was once by his own admission out-generalled, the Spanish campaign was



TROPHIES FROM GAUL

Caesar returned to Rome in 49 B.C. and the trophy on the reverse of this coin denotes his victories in Gaul. The figures LII (52) on the obverse may indicate his age and his eligibility for a second consulate.

*British Museum*

brought to a successful issue in six months, most of the troops joining his standard.

Returning to Rome, Caesar assumed the dictatorship in order to hold a consular election; as consul he passed some popular laws, and then prepared for the decisive contest in the East, where a large force was now collecting under Pompey and the senatorial leaders. The Pompeians held the seas, and it was with difficulty that he succeeded in crossing with his first army to Epirus, where he was shut up within his own lines by the much larger army of Pompey in November. With even more difficulty his lieutenant, Mark Antony, joined him with the second army in the spring of 48.

Some months of manoeuvring followed. Pompey, though his forces outnumbered Caesar's, knew that his eastern levies were not to be matched with Caesar's veterans, and wished to avoid a pitched battle; so did Cato, alone among the senatorials, because he wished to avoid bloodshed. The rest, detesting Pompey only less than Caesar, scoffed at his pusillanimity, and clamoured for battle; till at last, at midsummer, Pompey was goaded into delivering an attack, on the plain of Pharsalus in Thessaly. The fight hung

long in the balance, but ended in the complete rout of Pompey's army, with immense slaughter. Caesar's promises of clemency, faithfully kept, induced most of the Romans to surrender when the field was definitely lost, though that clemency was afterwards ill requited. Pompey himself escaped to the coast, took ship with a few loyal comrades, and made his way by slow degrees to Egypt, where on landing he found awaiting him not the asylum he looked for but the dagger of a Roman assassin, commissioned by the Egyptian government.

Until the battle of Pharsalus (or Pharsalia) had been lost and won, the odds on paper were all against Caesar. The Roman legions with Pompey numbered more men than those with Caesar, and Pompey had the resources of the East to draw upon. If Caesar had the treasury at Rome in his hands, Pompey had the wealth of Asia. Judged by military critics, Pompey was the sounder general. But half the men in Pompey's legions would have fought twice as enthusiastically under Caesar, while Caesar's were devoted to their leader. The orientals were no match for the westerns, and Greeks had long ceased to be good soldiers. And Pompey's hand was forced by the senatorial chiefs.

Even after the great defeat, all was not lost. Asia no doubt was off the board, but Egypt might be brought on to it. The Pompeians were in complete command of the sea. Africa was in their hands, and Juba of Numidia was with them. Caesar was not yet master.



#### JUBA KING OF MAURETANIA

Juba II was taken as a child captive to Rome by Caesar to grace his triumph in 46 B.C. He married the daughter of Antony and Cleopatra, and in 25 B.C. was recognized King of Mauretania, where he reigned until about 18 B.C.

*British Museum*

Therefore, at the first possible moment, he set out with a small force after Pompey and, evading the enemy fleets, tracked him to Egypt, where the government's envoys met him not with his living rival but with the dead man's head. For months to come, however, Caesar with his troops was locked up in Egypt. For the government, nominally that of the young king, Ptolemy Dionysus, was actually in the hands of a powerful minister, an ambitious adventurer named Achillas, who had no more intention of falling under Caesar's domination than Pompey's; while he was playing off against each other Ptolemy and his fascinating sister Cleopatra. Meanwhile the Pompeians were taking heart to renew the contest in Africa, and their fleets prevented reinforcements from reaching Caesar in Egypt, where in the intervals of critical fighting he was amusing himself with Cleopatra's charms.

It was not till the turn of the year that Caesar was able to inflict a crushing defeat on Achillas in which both the minister and Ptolemy lost their lives; and Caesar set Cleopatra on the throne of Egypt, where he continued to dally till May (47).

Pharnaces, the son of Mithradates, had seized the opportunity to recover power in Pontus. The legions in Spain were in mutiny against their Caesarian commander. Italy was uneasy. The Pompeians, among them two of Pompey's sons, Gnaeus and Sextus, were making head in Africa. In a lightning campaign, Caesar shattered the power of Pharnaces—the occasion of his famous dispatch, 'I came, I saw, I conquered'—and in July he was back in



#### JUBA I OF NUMIDIA

Cicero comments on Juba's fine head of hair and Suetonius relates that in 62 B.C. Caesar once pulled him by the beard. Thus this coin, inscribed in Punic on the reverse, bears a characteristic portrait. Juba was king of Numidia, 60-46 B.C.

*British Museum*

## Rome's Expansion

Rome, formally appointed dictator for the second time.


He found the legions in Campania mutinous, demanding their discharge. What they wanted was not discharge but more pay. Caesar coolly, but with stinging words of contemptuous reproach, discharged them; whereupon they implored him with tears to reinstate them on any terms, and he granted the petition. It was a triumph of personality.

Then he carried a force to Africa, but was unable to strike a decisive blow until in February (46) he shattered the senatorial forces at Thapsus. Cato, in charge at Utica, had declined all command in the civil war; but when he knew that the senatorial cause was lost, he committed suicide.

The sons of Pompey and some of the leaders who escaped fled to Spain; others,

like Cato, slew themselves. In friendly but mortal single combat Petreius—who in 49 had all but entrapped Caesar in Spain—was killed by the bold king of Numidia, Juba; who then by his own order was slain by one of his own slaves. Numidia was annexed and made a new province. At the end of May Caesar returned to Rome to celebrate a series of triumphs, not over Roman citizens but over the Gauls, Egypt, Pharnaces and Juba. For four months he was occupied, as dictator for the third time, in reorganizing the imperial system, in legislating and in planning and starting public works.

Then he was called again to Spain, where the Pompeys were once more trying to make head; both were sons born to Pompey before his marriage to Caesar's daughter. In Spain sickness kept him



**CLEOPATRA QUEEN OF EGYPT: LAST OF THE PTOLEMAIC DYNASTY**

Cleopatra, daughter of Ptolemy XIII Auletes, was born in 69 B.C. and became Queen of Egypt at the age of seventeen. Her personal fascination captivated Julius Caesar, by whom she had a son, Caesarion. All three are represented on the relief (left) on the temple of Hathor at Dendera. After Caesar's assassination Cleopatra returned to Egypt, became the mistress of Mark Antony, and after his defeat by Octavian at Actium fled to Alexandria, where she committed suicide, August 29, 30 B.C.

*Photos, Donald McIntosh and Mansell*


inactive till the end of the year. Then he moved on the Pompeians, and in March, 45, crushed them finally at Munda, the most desperately fought of all his battles. Sextus Pompeius escaped to the hills; Gnaeus and the other leaders fell. Six months more were occupied with the settlement of Spain; in October Caesar was once more in Rome.

Caesar did not promulgate a new constitution by legislation. Almost the only piece of legislation in that kind was the enlargement of the Senate which added to that body an immense number of nominees, including even provincials. Another—but more in appearance than in fact—was the extension of full Roman citizenship to all the Italian communities; for, since no system of representation had been devised, the right to vote did not in effect convey true political power. It was

however, a definite expression of Italian national unity.

But the scheme of a new constitution was implicit in his methods, which concentrated permanently in the hands of one man what had hitherto been emergency powers given only for a limited period. To Caesar they were conveyed in the form of a perpetual dictatorship over-riding the powers of the ordinary magistrates, but not dispensing with them.

Into the few months of his regime he compressed a surprising amount of social and economic legislation, intended at least to palliate chronic evils from which the community suffered. Incidentally, he reformed the calendar and placed it on the sound astronomical base which, with one small subsequent modification, is in use at the present day. It must also be remarked that on his return to



**AUTHENTIC SITE OF JULIUS CAESAR'S FUNERAL PYRE**

On the spot in the Forum where Julius Caesar was cremated an altar was erected and a marble pillar inscribed 'Parenti Patriae.' Augustus later built a temple, the Aedes Divi Iulii, on the site, and above is shown all that remains of that structure—blocks of tufa once coated with marble to which the beaks of the warships captured at Actium were affixed at the time. The actual spot where Caesar was incinerated is marked by the round core of an altar built of concrete with chips of the original pillar.

*From Rudolfo Lanciani, 'The Roman Forum'*

## Rome's Expansion

Rome in 46 Caesar astonished the world by setting aside all precedent and declaring a complete amnesty; taking no sort of revenge on any of his past enemies, public or private, and extending to many of them favours which almost any other man would have reserved for his personal friends or partisans. Yet that magnanimity failed to conciliate either their jealousy or their abstract devotion to republican theory.

A monarchy, a tyrannis, was in fact established, under the republican title of dictatorship, while the ancient title of kingship remained as intolerable as ever to the Roman mind. That fact was made obvious when Caesar's lieutenant Antony offered him a kingly crown at the festival of the Lupercalia in February, 44, an offer which he rejected with dramatic effect but with obvious reluctance. On that fact his enemies, former adherents of Pompey for the most part, counted, but counted too confidently. To effect his overthrow by any legal methods was manifestly impossible, but Caesar was aiming at making himself king, and tradition extolled tyrannicide. A conspiracy was formed by a group which included several men who were designated for the highest offices, some of them his personal friends. He never took precautions for his personal safety; and at a meeting of the Senate on the Ides (15th) of March, they gathered round him on the pretext of urging a petition, and stabbed him to death.

### Mark Antony and Octavian

FOR the moment Caesar's fall produced sheer paralysis. The conspirators imagined that they were going to restore the senatorial republic amid general acclamation; when, actually, none save politicians of their own party were ready to acclaim them. Among them there were prominent and able men, but no individual of dominating capacity or personality. The enemy they had most to fear was Mark Antony, consul designate, a favourite lieutenant of the murdered dictator, a notorious profligate, a man of brilliant but erratic abilities, boundless ambition, no moral scruples and a whole-hearted devotion to his dead chief. There would



### MEMORIALS OF TRAGIC LOVERS

The upper copper tetradrachm of Mark Antony bears a bust of his wife Octavia on the reverse above a mystic cista set between coiled serpents. On the Phoenician tetradrachm below Mark Antony appears with her supplanter, Cleopatra.

From Ward, 'Greek Coins.' John Murray

almost certainly be a duel between the conspirators' party and Antony. Neither of them took count of a lad of eighteen away in Macedon, whom the childless Caesar had adopted, his great-nephew Octavius; now to be known as Caesar Octavianus, though the adoption had not been made in form.

THE duel did not open at once; there was a hollow reconciliation. Antony, however, secured Caesar's papers and obtained from a hesitating Senate formal ratification of Caesar's acts, and a public funeral; at which the consul's speech and the reading of Caesar's will produced a violent revulsion of popular sentiment against the self-styled 'Liberators.' The assassins withdrew hastily from Rome, where Antony, who could produce authority for everything he chose to do from Caesar's papers, genuine or forged, was master of the situation. The ablest soldier among the conspirators, Decimus Brutus, took possession of Cisalpine Gaul, which Caesar had assigned to him; the military position was extremely uncertain, and negotiations continued to pass between the republican chiefs and Antony.


Young Octavian appeared on the scene, self-contained and inscrutable, but of an



adamantine resolution, claiming to be his dead uncle's representative, and as his heir discharging faithfully all the provisions of the will; ready to make terms, but only his own terms, with either party, holding the balance in his own hands. Antony began to fear an active rival, the liberators a remorseless enemy, while the young man would commit himself to neither. The legions that were in Italy seemed likely to transfer their allegiance to the young Octavian.

Decimus Brutus was in possession of his province. Lepidus, a most ineffective person, was in possession of the old Transalpine Province. The dictator had assigned Macedon and Syria to two of the most prominent among the conspirators, Marcus Brutus (85-42) and Gaius Cassius; who left Italy to take possession and raise troops for the coming contest, in the autumn. Antony claimed the three provinces for himself, his brother and his fellow consul Dolabella, whom he had bought.

In the autumn, then, Antony was trying to vanquish Decimus Brutus, whom he besieged in Mutina. Cicero, who had known nothing of the conspiracy but approved it as an accomplished fact, was left to lead the party of opposition to Antony; he conceived his own influence to be supreme with Octavian, and he now attacked Antony in the famous series of orations known as the Philippics. Antony was declared a public enemy; Octavian joined the new consuls, Hirtius and Pansa, old officers of his uncle, and now the official commanders of the government



#### AN IRRECONCILABLE REPUBLICAN

Marcus Junius Brutus (85-42 B.C.) took the side of Pompey in the Civil War. Although after Pharsalus Caesar showed him clemency, Brutus was one of the Dictator's murderers. He committed suicide after his defeat at Philippi.

*Museo Capitolino, Rome; photo, Brogi*

forces. In the early months of 43 Antony was driven out of Cisalpine into Transalpine Gaul. But both the consuls were killed in the fighting; Antony persuaded Lepidus and his legions to join him, and the pair came to terms secretly with Octavian.

Octavian with his legions marched to Rome and at the age of twenty claimed the consulship, having none to say him nay. Then he summoned the assassins of Caesar to stand trial. They were, of course, condemned to death by default. While the governors of Spain and Farther Gaul were at last declaring themselves supporters, Antony, Octavian and Lepidus met at Bononia (Bologna) and constituted themselves (officially by decree of the Senate) *Triumvirs* for the establishment of the Republic, the term which always stood for the Roman state. A part of their programme was a proscription, for the thoroughness of which Sulla had set the precedent, with no mercy and more malice than policy in it. The most distinguished of their victims—whom Octavian did not think it worth



#### A CRIME IN LIBERTY'S NAME

A cardinal event in history is commemorated in this coin with its portrait of Brutus and, on the reverse, the famous Cap of Liberty, set between daggers above the date the *Ides* of March, when Caesar fell.

*British Museum*

while to protect from the venomous, if natural, hatred of Antony—was Cicero. Then the triumvirs appropriated their respective shares of the West, though with very little regard for Lepidus, and prepared for the decisive struggle in the East.

No heavy engagements took place before the two battles on the plain near Philippi in Macedonia, fought with an interval of some three weeks in the late autumn of 42. In the first the actual success was with Brutus, but Cassius, under the mistaken impression that the day was lost, was by his own order slain by a slave. In the second Brutus was defeated; his men refused to renew the battle next day, and he died by the reluctant hand of a friend.

The victors, Antony and Octavian, parted the empire between them, for Lepidus did not count. In effect Antony took the East and Octavian the West, though in fact they did find an unexpected rival in Sextus Pompeius, who, having held a command in the enemy's fleet, acquired naval supremacy in the Mediterranean. For nearly ten years there was no



**FUTURE MASTER OF THE WORLD**


Octavian was eighteen, studying at Apollonia, when he learnt of the death of Julius Caesar; and the immature, studious-looking features of this bust show how little the Roman world can have recognized its future master.

*Uffizi Gallery, Florence; photo, Brogi*

open collision between Antony and the young Caesar, though there was much friction and actual war was more than once averted with difficulty.

While Octavian returned to Italy, Antony proceeded through Greece and Asia Minor, mainly for the purpose of extorting money from the provincials. At Tarsus in Cilicia, about the midsummer of 41, he met the queen of Egypt, Cleopatra, and from that time was utterly enslaved by her fascinations.

The East, in fact, demanded vigour; for a Roman officer, Labienus, joined the Parthian king Pacorus; already in 41 Pacorus was overrunning Syria and Labienus Asia Minor. Antony roused himself, but was diverted by dissensions with Octavian in the West, leagued himself with Sextus Pompeius against his rival, and would have plunged into open war had not the death of his wife Fulvia provided an opportunity for a hollow reconciliation at Brundisium, when he married Octavian's sister Octavia. The deserted Sextus demonstrated his effective power by a naval blockade of Italy, now mainly dependent on imports for its corn supplies, whereby he forced the triumvirs to admit him to partnership,



**A SPLENDID VICTIM OF AMBITION**

Marcus Antonius (83-30 B.C.) was one of the triumvirs who at Philippi avenged Julius Caesar's murder. Thereafter he shared the Roman world with Octavian until in 31 B.C. East and West joined battle, and at Actium he met defeat.

*Vatican Museum; photo, Anderson*

receiving as his share Sardinia, Sicily and Achaea (39).

Antony lingered at Athens with his new wife before returning to Cleopatra. The Parthian war had been entrusted to a soldier whose abilities had raised him from the ranks, Ventidius Bassus. In this year (39) he routed and captured Labienus, and drove the Parthian forces over the Euphrates, and in 38 repeated his success against Pacorus, who fell in the battle.

Octavian was preparing for a struggle with Sextus; but in 37 his relations with his brother-in-law were still amicable, and the triumvirate was renewed without other authority than that of the triumvirs themselves. Now, however, Antony tired of Octavia and returned to his Egyptian mistress, who never again lost her fatal hold on him. In 36 he flung himself into a new Parthian campaign to recover the standards lost seventeen years before at Carrhae; but instead of achieving a triumph narrowly escaped destruction by a hasty retreat. Antony consoled himself, however, by a military demonstration in Armenia, on the strength of which he celebrated a triumph on his return to Alexandria. Incidentally, of his own authority he redistributed the crowns of



THIRD OF THE TRIUMVIRS

At the time of Caesar's death M. Aemilius Lepidus was commanding a proconsular army, which, more than his own character, obtained for him the position of triumvir with Octavian and Antony.

*Vatican; photo, Anderson*

minor vassal kingdoms, handing over Judaea to Herod of Idumaea; while his behaviour in Egypt warranted the growing belief that he was dreaming of making himself King of the World, with Cleopatra as his consort.

On his return to Rome after Philippi, Octavian had been forced to satisfy his veterans by great confiscations of land where-with to reward them, according to promise. Advantage of the intense and justifiable resentment thus aroused in Italy was taken by Antony's brother Lucius; as consul he attempted to overthrow Octavian

by armed force, but was compelled, mainly by the abilities of Agrippa (63 B.C.—A.D. 12), formerly the comrade and now the right-hand man of Octavian, to abandon the contest in 40 and retire from Italy. This was the occasion of the breach between the triumvirs, ended by the pact of Brundisium in 39; which set Octavian comparatively free for the task of reorganizing the West.

But Sextus, master of the seas, was an embarrassment, and the first attempts to challenge his power failed completely. The invaluable Agrippa came to the rescue. Only in 36, when he had organized and trained new fleets, was the naval campaign inaugurated. Sextus, after a defeat by Agrippa and a victory over Octavian, was crushed by the former at Naulochus, and, falling later into the hands of lieutenants of Antony, who had held aloof, was put to death. The third triumvir, Lepidus, then tried to assert himself, but submitted when his troops deserted to Octavian, was deposed from the triumvirate, and was relegated to a dignified obscurity as Pontifex Maximus.

Friction, complaints and counter-complaints, popular uneasiness and suspicion of Antony's designs grew rapidly, and reached a climax in 32, when Antony



REBEL SON OF POMPEY

Defeated at Thapsus in Africa, Sextus Pompeius joined his elder brother in Spain, but escaped from the defeat at Munda and, after Caesar's death, raised a fleet that dominated the Mediterranean until defeated by Agrippa at Naulochus.

*British Museum*

## Rome's Expansion

insulted Caesar by openly repudiating his marriage with the blameless Octavia, who had borne with his flagrant infidelity and done her best to smooth matters between her husband and her brother. Octavian's time had come. Rome declared war on Egypt—it had not even been necessary to wait for the formal repudiation.

At last Antony roused himself, and repaired to Greece, of which he had retained possession. But his design of invading Italy was rendered futile by Agrippa's fleet. Octavian landed with troops in Epirus, but he knew that as a general he was no match for Antony, and through the winter both sides played a waiting game which was all in the favour of Octavian. Antony could trust neither his officers nor his men, who were being seduced from their allegiance.


He had, however, collected a great fleet; and at midsummer (31) he decided to abandon his army and retreat with his ships. Having made all his preparations secretly, he embarked with Cleopatra at the end of August, and the whole fleet sailed away; but it was overtaken by Agrippa and forced to engage off Actium on September 2. Antony's fleet was much the heavier, and the issue was still doubtful, when Cleopatra with sixty ships broke away in full flight for Egypt. Antony deserted the battle and followed the magnet. The rest of the fleet fought on desperately, till every ship was burnt, sunk or captured. The army which had been left behind went over en masse to Octavian.

The battle of Actium was decisive. There was no need for Octavian to hasten in pursuit of the fugitives in their ignominious flight. Antony, from the moment when he yielded to that mad impulse at Actium, was a beaten man. He shut himself up in Pharos, facing Alexandria. Cleopatra, for whose sake he had flung himself away, had been the mistress

of Julius and the mistress of Antony; now she was, or seemed to be, ready to become the mistress of the new master of East and West.

But when in July (30 B.C.) Octavian appeared before Pelusium with his fleet, she too secluded herself in Alexandria. Pelusium promptly surrendered. Antony made one despairing effort: at the head of a body of horse he fell upon and routed a body of his enemy's troops. But the whole fleet at Alexandria went over; resistance was an obvious absurdity; the false rumour had been circulated that Cleopatra was dead, so Antony committed suicide, surviving only long enough to die in the arms of the repentant queen. From Octavian she soon learnt that she had nothing to hope but shame; and his emissaries only found, as he had learned, that she had followed her lover to death, not without a characteristic regard for dramatic effect.

Octavian stood alone, without possible rival, undisputed and indisputable lord of the civilized world.



**OCTAVIAN'S MOST TRUSTED MINISTER**

Born of undistinguished parentage, M. Vipsanius Agrippa was a student friend of Octavian and afterwards became his right-hand man, equally successful as general, admiral, foreign administrator and director of public works. This bust conveys an excellent impression of his stern, blunt character.

*Uffizi Gallery, Florence: photo, Alinari*



#### HUB OF THE ROMAN STATE: THE FORUM SEEN TO-DAY FROM THE AIR

In the Forum centred Rome's civic life, commercial, legal and political. Originally a portion called the 'comitium'—that beyond and to the left of the Arch of Severus in the foreground—was set aside for the various 'comitia' or popular assemblies; but as the population grew the whole Forum had to be used. It was from a platform to the right of the Arch, the 'rostra,' that the magistrates addressed the multitude as it stood before them like the orderly ranks of an army.

*Press Bureau Aeronautique Italienne*

# THE FABRIC OF THE ROMAN STATE

How the Constitution of the Republic was built up through Centuries of Experiment and Adaptation

By H. STUART-JONES

Principal of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, Late Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford; Author of *Classical Rome*, etc.

HOW Roman society arose from the fusion of patricians and plebeians was explained in Chapter 55, and some account was given of the way in which the latter class first formed a state within the state and then won its way to sovereign rights co-ordinate with those of the older community, upon whose institutions its own were modelled in important respects. Those institutions and their development in the patricio-plebeian state we must now describe.

It would be beside the point to attempt, with the materials available, a reconstruction of the Roman constitution in the period of the kings—not the Etruscan rulers who exercised, as we saw, a temporary dominion in Rome, but the ‘reges,’ who bear a good Indo-Germanic name, found both among the Celtic-speaking peoples (Irish ‘righ’; ‘rix’ in Gaulish names) and in India (‘raj’). It conformed, no doubt, to the general type which is exemplified in Homeric and in early Spartan society, and its three constituent elements were the king, the council of elders (‘senatus’), and the assembly (‘comitia’). This last word, by its plural form, indicates that votes were cast by the individual as a member of a group, and that the decision was taken by a majority of the groups, not of the individuals.

The Romans held firmly by the principle that no valid resolution could be taken except by an assembly duly marshalled by its lawful convener: there might be a ‘gathering’ (‘conventio,’ ‘contio’) summoned in order to hear proclamations, or even the discussion of public policies by those whom the chairman permitted to speak. But before the people was called

upon to express its will this gathering was formally dissolved and its members were grouped in accordance with some definite principle of arrangement. Of such assemblies there were three forms: ‘comitia curiata,’ ‘comitia centuriata’ and ‘comitia tributa,’ distinguished by the principle of grouping by ‘curiae,’ centuries or tribes.

The first of these was the original form of the Roman popular assembly, which Roman conservatism retained down to the age of Caesar and Cicero, although it had been stripped of all important functions at a very early period. Of the groups which composed it, the curiae, little can be said with certainty. The antiquarians of later date believed that they were cemented by

ties of blood, real or supposed; in other words, that they were groups of households; and Greek writers on Roman affairs equated ‘genos’ (family, in the widest sense) with ‘gens,’ ‘phratría’ (brotherhood) with ‘curia,’ and ‘phyle’ (tribe) with ‘tribus.’ They probably conceived of a symmetrical distribution of the Roman people into three tribes, thirty curiae and (perhaps) three hundred gentes, a scheme which corresponds closely enough with that which some historians of Athens posited as the original framework of the Attic community. The three tribes would be the Ramnes, Tities and Luceres, whose names survived as those of the senior cavalry regiments or ‘centuries,’ once exclusively patrician; although the theory to the effect that the early levy was made up of 1,000 men (‘milites’ from ‘mille,’ a thousand) taken from each of these tribes is only

Forms of the  
Popular Assembly

an antiquarian's guess; and those who held this view naturally, but probably wrongly, connected the word 'tribus' with 'tres' (three.).

But there is no sign that any unit except the curia had a political function, and we find 'curia' used to designate a division of the people in other Latin communities, and in the 'Latin' colonies which Rome founded on the old model. All we can then say is that the curia represents the oldest form of grouping common to the Romans and their Latin kinsfolk. What we know of the functions assigned to the primitive

**Functions of the** assembly rests upon the  
**Comitia Curiata** inferences which may be drawn from the formalities

which it observed in historical times, when the thirty curiae were represented by thirty lictors. One of these is of special importance. The Roman magistrate was elected, as we shall find, by the quasi-military assembly of the centuries, but this did not suffice to invest him with the 'imperium,' the authority derived from the people in virtue of which he exercised command in war, administered justice in peace and transmitted his office to his successor. For this purpose the assembly of the curiae was summoned, and a 'law concerning the imperium' was solemnly passed.

There were cases in later times in which this formality was omitted or its performance obstructed, and difficult constitutional questions then arose. The law-courts were paralysed in the year 57 B.C. because the democratic tribune Clodius vetoed the passing of the necessary law; and in 49 B.C. the adherents of Caesar denied the right of the magistrates who had fled from Italy on his approach and established themselves at Thessalonica to hold elections for the magistracies of the ensuing year, because in their haste they had omitted to receive the imperium in the prescribed form.

The assembly of the curiae also met under the presidency of the Pontifex Maximus to represent the community in its religious capacity, whether for the consecration of those appointed to the greater priesthoods ('rex' and 'flamines') or for the purpose of giving assent to those acts

which, like the adoption of one paterfamilias by another (see Chap. 78), or the making of a will in the ancient form, might affect the maintenance of family rites.

If we are to believe Roman traditions, this assembly was shorn of its powers as early as the regal period. The name of Servius Tullius is associated with the institution of the 'census,' or mustering of the host, followed by a ceremony of purification ('lustrum'), which was, perhaps, first performed at irregular intervals, but during the later Republican period (until civil war and the reforms of Sulla intervened) took place every five years. At the census each citizen made a declaration of his age and of the property (at first only the lands) which he possessed, and in accordance therewith he was placed in a 'centuria'; the 'centuriae' were then grouped in classes graduated according to property, and voted as units in a new assembly, which henceforth became the chief organ for the expression of the people's will.

One of our ancient authorities represents the supposed reform of Servius Tullius as designed to transfer voting power from the poor (who formed the majority in the curiae) to the wealthy, but this is a projection of later politics into early history. It remains true that the centuriae

the Centuries  
the centuriate assembly was so organized as to give a preponderance to the richer classes, since the number of voting units in the first class was far larger than that in the others, and the 'cavalry'—mounted infantry would be a more correct description—who were drawn from the wealthier strata cast their votes in centuriae of their own, with the result that when they voted with the centuries of the first class (as they naturally would when social questions were at issue), it needed but a few extra units to constitute an absolute majority, and as soon as this was secured the voting ceased. It must not be thought, however, that the sole object of the new institution was to secure the predominance of the 'possessing' class.

The assembly was an army, definitely recognized as such. It might not meet within the city—that is, within the ideal city bounded by the line of the 'pomerium'

—because, as one authority tells us, 'the command of an army must be exercised outside the city.' It is called by the antiquarian, Varro, 'exercitus urbanus'—the city's army. It was summoned by the blast of the trumpet, and red flags were hoisted on the Capitol and on the Janiculum when it met, and struck if a sudden attack was threatened by a foreign foe. The 'elders' were kept apart from the 'juniors,' who formed the active army as distinct from the reserve. And the property qualifications were primarily intended to secure that each individual should be able to provide his own equipment in an array of battle comparable with the 'hoplite phalanx' of the Greek communities. No doubt in the most primitive form of the assembly it was the provision of the heavier or the lighter equipment which determined the voting power of the citizen. In historical times the classes, five in number, were distinguished by money qualifications, and these are stated by our authorities in terms which imply the reduced standard of coinage of the Punic War; but though the figures might easily be adjusted in view of monetary changes, it is certain that Rome had no coined money before the latter part of the fourth century B.C. On the other hand, the tactical disposition implied in our accounts is that of the solid phalanx, which was abandoned by the Romans in the Samnite wars, and whatever we think of the legend of Servius Tullius, we are at any rate bound to admit that the nation in arms was organized for political purposes not later (and doubtless earlier) than the fourth century.

It may well be, however, that the graduation of property classes belongs to that period, for there are traces of an earlier terminology in which there was but one 'class' (i.e. 'summoning to arms') other than that of the cavalry: namely, the fully-armed hoplite. It must be added that the century was not a tactical unit, and this was true even of the mounted force, which was divided into squadrons of thirty men. It no doubt served as a muster-roll, but it was primarily a voting group, and thus even the 'proletarii'

who were unable to take their place in the ranks of the citizen army had their 'century,' though it was rarely, if ever, called upon to cast its vote. The technical branches of the army, it should be added, such as the armourers, trumpeters and so forth, voted in centuries of their own. There is, of course, not the slightest hint that at any period the distinction of 'patres' and 'plebs' was recognized in the assembly; and to whatever date its inception belongs, it did represent, however imperfectly, that nation in arms which was the Roman people.

Of the primitive council of elders we know nothing in detail. It was a fundamental principle with the Romans that before taking action those who exercised authority in state or household should 'take The Senate or Council of Elders advisers. The pater-familias, sitting as a judge in his own house, is required 'by ancient custom,' as Tacitus informs us when telling the story of Pomponia Graecina, to summon a family council. The general in the field had his staff, and an inscription is preserved which shows that in 90 B.C. the father of Pompey the Great, commanding in the war between Rome and her revolting allies, conferred citizenship upon a troop of Spanish horsemen who had distinguished themselves in the field in virtue of the powers given him by a Lex Julia, but that in so doing he acted 'on the advice of his staff,' whose names are set out at length.

The Senate is the supreme example of such an advisory body, and the Roman theory was that the head of the state formed it by free choice of 'the best men.' Thus legend said that Romulus had 'chosen' the first patres to form his Senate, and throughout Roman history the revision of the roll of Senators was called a 'choosing' ('lectio'). How this choice became limited by constitutional usage we shall presently see; negatively, the power of rejecting an officially qualified candidate on the ground of personal *unfitness remained unchallenged* in its exercise by the magistrates to whom the duty of drawing up the list was assigned. The Senate's power rested on no





WHERE THE ROMAN SENATE DELIBERATED

Rome's 'council of elders,' the Senate, met in the Curia on the north-west of the Forum. In a sense it is well preserved, though it has several times been rebuilt; owing to its dedication as a church to Sant' Adriano in the seventh century, the original form was retained on each occasion.

*From Lancelotti, 'The Roman Forum'*

legislative enactment but was the most conspicuous example of respect for 'the custom of the ancestors' which Rome could show. Its resolutions possessed the highest degree of 'auctoritas' (authority), and that name was given to the act by which it gave its sanction to the laws passed by the people as well as to the election of magistrates and (according to tradition) to that of the king himself.

The legends which cluster about the transition from kingship to republican government do not call for discussion. The more radical critics of Roman tradition have conjectured that royalty was not abolished at one stroke, but limited by the establishment of co-ordinate powers and the restriction of its functions to those connected with religious observance, somewhat after the manner of early Athens. The title 'rex' was certainly retained as that of a priesthood (see page 1596); but this proves nothing, and we may assume that the powers inherent in the kingly office were in fact, as the Romans believed, transferred to a dual magistracy.

The familiar title of the chief magistrates of Rome was not, if the constitutional lawyers spoke truly, the earliest in use. 'Praetor,' the 'leader' in war, was, we are told, the earliest title employed,

and it has parallels in the Latin cities, in Praeneste, for example, although the name 'dictator,' to which the Romans gave a specialised significance, is more common among them. The most remarkable feature of the chief magistracy at Rome is, of course, its duality, and, so far as we can judge, the Romans here led the way, for a dual magistracy cannot be shown to be primitive either among the Latin kinsfolk of the Romans or among the Italic stocks. Amongst the Oscans we sometimes find more than one official with the title of 'meddix,' but it appears that one of these enjoyed a higher rank than the others. With the dual magistracy of the consuls went the introduction

of the principle of 'collegiality,' which played so important a part in the Roman political system. The Romans did not attain to the idea of official boards, making their decisions by the vote of a majority, which seems so natural to us. When the Roman was entrusted with office, he might be given authority to issue commands or prohibitions to those inferior to himself in the hierarchy, but officials of equal rank possessed equal powers, and each could paralyse the action of his 'colleague.'

Whether of design or not, this principle (the successful working of which depended on the spirit of accommodation and compromise which was ingrained in the Roman character) served to limit the tremendous power placed in the hands of the magistrate under the name of 'imperium.' Not only did this cover the whole field of public activity, since the magistrate was in theory the supreme commander of armies in the field, the arbiter of law at home, the representative of the state in its relation with the gods and the controller of civic administration, but it was reinforced by the right of 'coercitio'—that of enforcing submission to his decrees by the threat of pains and penalties.

The limitation of the tenure of office to a single year, and the check imposed upon each magistrate by the existence of a colleague with equal authority, were not deemed sufficient to protect the citizen from the abuse of magisterial power. We saw how the right of appeal ('provocatio') to the judgement of the assembled people, traditionally ascribed to a law of the first year of the Republic, was secured by the plebs through its recognition in the decemviral code (see pages 1648-51); but though a law was passed on the fall of the decemvirs threatening dire penalties against anyone who should again set up 'a magistracy without appeal,' it is by no means clear that there was a really effective sanction which could be applied to the magistrate who refused to respect the citizen's right. We are told that the first law guaranteeing the appeal was passed in 300 B.C., and that even then the sanction merely consisted in the enactment that if a magistrate should override the demand for trial before the people, it should be deemed 'an infamous deed,' and that three laws passed by three members of the family of the Porcii (one of them, no doubt, Cato the elder) in the second century B.C. furnished the first adequate security.

On the other hand, the perilous position in which Rome stood in the early years of the Republic led to the suspension of the collegiate magistracy and the institution, in moments of crisis, of a single dictator (the original title, we are told, was 'master of the people') who had under his command a 'master of horse,' and for six months enjoyed the unlimited imperium. The procedure by which he was appointed was remarkable. The people decreed that a dictator was to be set up, but had no voice in his election: he was 'nominated' by one of the consuls.

The history of this office illustrates the Roman habit of turning old institutions to new ends. It is probable that the earliest dictators were appointed to exercise military command when Rome was threatened with grave external danger; then we find them set up when civil strife threatened to disrupt the fabric of the state; the great example of this was

the appointment of Hortensius in 287 B.C. to bring to a close the long struggle for full recognition of the validity of the resolutions of the plebs (see Chap. 55). In the following century there were scarcely any examples of the 'emergency' dictatorship with general powers; but dictatorships with special and limited function (almost a contradiction in terms) were established—as for filling up the gaps in the depleted ranks of the Senate after the disaster of Cannae, for holding elections when the consuls were in the field, even for celebrating the 'Latin games' in the absence of the higher magistrates. But at the end of the Hannibalic war this practice was dropped, and it might have been thought that the institution had outlived its purpose. More than a century later it was revived in an entirely new form by Sulla, who enjoyed special powers of 'revising the constitution' which apparently were not restricted in time and went beyond the limits of the early dictatorship; and this formed a precedent for Caesar, who went a step farther, and received the dictatorship first for ten years and then for life.

To the early days of the Republic is ascribed the increase in the number of 'tribes,' in the sense of territorial divisions of the lands of Rome; and at some date which we cannot fix a third assembly of the 'populus,' based on the tribe in which the citizen and his property were registered, came into existence—the first mention of it in our historical texts belongs to the year 357 B.C., when it imposed a tax on the manumission of slaves. The 'comitia tributa,' as they were called, acquired a variety of powers, including a right to hear appeals against fines.

A civilized state demands an administrative system worked by officials with specialised functions; but Rome was slow to take the first steps in this direction. In historical times the moneys of the state, lodged in its treasury in the vaults of the temple of Saturn, were kept in the custody of 'quaestores'; but their name ('trackers') shows that this was not their primary function, and there is a tradition (or rather a number of inconsistent tradi-

Powers of the  
Comitia Tributa

Dictatorship  
and its uses

tions) to the effect that from the regal period onwards 'quaestores parricidii' ('trackers of murder') were appointed; whether they were identical with the treasurers, or whether the treasurers were of later creation, and, if so, at what date the office was set up, was evidently quite uncertain. An interesting document, preserved to us in Varro's work *On the Latin Language*, which professes to give an account of a capital trial before the people, shows that such trials were conducted, not by the supreme magistrate possessing the imperium, but by his quaestor, who 'borrowed auspices' from him and summoned the assembly to judgement. The reason for this procedure was that it was not consonant with the dignity of the chief magistrate to pronounce a judgement which the people might reverse.

In cases where the safety of the state was at stake, special Commissioners of Treason ('duoviri perduellionis') were appointed. The procedure in such trials is

described for us by Livy in the archetypal case of Horatius, though, as the crime for which he was tried was the murder of his sister, the case would seem to be one of 'parricidium' rather than 'perduellio.' An attempt to revise this procedure (which had long become obsolete) was made in 63 B.C., when an aged man, Rabirius, was accused of unlawfully slaying the demagogue Saturninus in the seditious outbreak of 100 B.C. This was simply a political demonstration by Caesar and the democrats, and brought Cicero into the field in defence of the prisoner.

In the institutions just described we find the rudiments of a system of criminal jurisdiction. In the course of the fifth century an important step was taken with the object of transferring certain important administrative functions from the consuls to officials not invested with imperium, thus leaving the supreme magistrates free for waging the

#### The Censors and their duties

almost continuous warfare in which the young Republic was engaged. These were the censors, who were first appointed, according to Livy, in 443 B.C. As the name shows, their primary duty was the holding of the census, which, as we saw, was in origin simply the 'numbering of the host' and the organization of the nation in arms for political purposes. The censors had no imperium, and as the functions which they performed needed a considerable time for their proper performance they were allowed eighteen months for the completion of their work. They were two in number, and the principle of collegiality applied to them, so that in case of their disagreement (which in the later Republic was not infrequent) they were unable to discharge part or all of their manifold duties.

The census proper was a process of registration. In order to determine the liability of the individual citizen in



#### WHERE QUAESTORS GUARDED THE PUBLIC MONEYS

The public treasury of Rome was the ancient temple of Saturn in the Forum, said to have been first built in 497, but certainly given its present style by Munatius Plancus in 42 B.C. The patchwork appearance of the surviving columns is due to bad restoration after the fire of Carinus, A.D. 283.

Photo, Anderson

respect of taxation and military service, the censors placed him in a tribe, which in the first instance (for membership was hereditary) would naturally be that in which his land lay, and in this he paid his 'tributum,' or war-levy; and also in a 'century,' which (as we saw) was at once a muster-roll and a voting unit. This function came to acquire political importance, since the censors, by their administrative action, could determine the status of those who acquired Roman citizenship either by manumission or by grant from the people; the treatment of freedmen varied at different periods according to the views of the censors, who, if they wished to restrict their voting power, could register them in the four 'city' tribes, in which they would be swamped by numbers. Again, the censors could inflict penalties for misconduct by means of their

**Political powers of the Censors** power of registration; they could 'remove' a voter from his tribe—transfer him to one of the city wards—and 'make him a tax-payer,' that is, erase his name from the roll of his century, thus depriving him of the franchise. The most remarkable example of the exercise of this power was given when M. Livius Salinator, one of the censors of 204 B.C., disfranchised the whole of the voters except those belonging to the tribe Maecia, which had been the only one to vote for his acquittal when he had been condemned to a fine for unjust distribution of booty and had consistently voted *against* his election as consul and censor.

It was naturally part of the censors' duty to draw up the list of 'equites' and to review the corps; and this may have suggested the important innovation, ascribed to a tribune Ovinus, by which the revision of the senatorial roll was entrusted to the censors—the date is uncertain, but must have been earlier than 312 B.C. This placed in their hands a disciplinary power in the exercise of which they were not held to account by any higher authority and were not called upon to use judicial procedure. Such a power, however, could not be exercised arbitrarily, and the result was in time to set up a code of civil honour, the breach of which was

punished by exclusion from the Senate; and the effects were far-reaching, since the customary rules laid down by the censors were copied by the magistrates presiding in the civil courts, and those who broke them incurred 'infamia,' which carried with it certain civic disabilities. The disciplinary powers of the censors were reinforced by the 'care of morals' which was incumbent upon them as the 'purifiers' of the host, whose office terminated with the ceremony of the 'lustrum.' It was their duty to see that unclean and disorderly elements were expelled, and hence they came to issue such edicts as that promulgated in 92 B.C., suppressing the schools of 'Latin rhetoricians.'

The censors were also entrusted with the management of the properties of the state—lands, mining rights, fisheries and so forth—and were empowered to enter into contracts on its behalf, usually for the term of five years, at the end of which their successors could rescind or vary them; and it was their duty to contract for the performance of public works. This must go back to an early date, since their first act, we are told, was to invite tenders for a fresh coat of vermilion paint for the Capitoline statue of Jupiter and for the feeding of his sacred geese.

During the acute phase of the struggle of the orders no progress was made with the elaboration of the machinery of government; but in 366 B.C., when the great issue of the admission of plebeians to the consulship was finally decided,

**Creation of new offices**

a creation of new offices took place which Livy treats as a compromise. A third praetor (who never received the title of consul) was set up 'to administer law as between citizens,' and two new aediles were added to the 'wardens of the plebs.' It was part of the compromise that these offices should be confined to patricians; but it was not long before the praetorship was thrown open to the plebs, and the 'curule' aediles, as they were called, were taken from the ranks of patricians and plebeians in alternate years. The duties of these officers were connected with the care of public buildings, the maintenance of order and cleanliness in streets and public places, the supervision of the

market and the celebration of public games; and they were given the right to levy fines, against which, if they exceeded a certain sum, an appeal lay from the curule aedile to the 'comitia tributa.'

With the constitutional settlement of 287 B.C. (the passing of the Lex Hortensia, see page 1653), the fabric of the Roman state was practically completed; fresh magistracies were sparingly created, and there was but little constitutional change by legislative enactment. In 242 B.C. a fourth praetor was appointed to 'administer law as between foreigners,' who were flocking to Rome as her commercial importance increased; the following year saw the last additions to the number of tribes, which was made

up to thirty-five; and at some date which was not earlier than this, nor later than the outbreak of the Hannibalic war, an alteration in the method of voting in the assembly of centuries was made. All that we can say of this last is that tribes as well as centuries were in some way recognized in the comitia centuriata, probably by the assignment to each tribe of five centuries of 'seniors' and five of 'juniors' drawn from each of the property classes, and thus the preponderance of wealth previously secured to the first class was neutralised; the eighteen centuries of knights, however, retained their separate existence.

The changes which took place in the Roman political system were not so much in the form of institutions as in their spirit and working. The Romans were always ready to adapt their organs of government to new needs, and the problems which now pressed for solution, chiefly arising from the external factors of rapid territorial growth and the protracted struggle with the power of Carthage, gave them every opportunity of applying their principles. First and foremost, it became necessary for Rome to pursue a fixed and continuous policy, such as no succession of annual magistrates could conceive or carry out; and the direction of this policy naturally fell into the hands of the Senate, which, being itself a body of ex-magistrates, was the incarnation of all Rome's experience in government.

We do not know when the prescriptive right of ex-officials to be placed on the roll became established by custom, but Livy, writing of the year 215 B.C., speaks of 'Senators and those who had held offices entitling them to be placed on the roll.' In the following year, owing to the depletion of the senatorial ranks by losses in war (especially at Cannae), a dictator, appointed to revise the roll, placed thereon all existing Senators, all curule magistrates 'not yet enrolled' (implying their right to seats), all the lesser magistrates (the aediles of the plebs, tribunes and quaestors) and those who had obtained decorations or spoils in the field. In summoning the Senate, the convener addressed his edict to 'Senators and those who have the right to give their advice in the Senate,' and this latter class must clearly mean those office-holders who were awaiting the next census to take their place on the roll. The Senate, then, represented Roman officialdom; and the official class grew into an official caste. The equality of rights secured in 287 B.C. was no guarantee of equal opportunities; and office-holding tended to concentrate itself in the hands of a limited number of families, upon whom the prizes of public life were constantly bestowed.

This new aristocracy was known as 'nobilitas.' There has been dispute as to the precise significance of this term, and it has been maintained that only the descendants of one who had held the consulship were entitled to style themselves 'nobiles'; but this can only be maintained if we include amongst such nobles plebeians who bore the same gentile name as patrician consuls of the early Republic, and it seems best to believe that the tenure of one of the 'curule' offices (aedileship, praetorship or consulship) sufficed to make a man and his descendants 'noble' in the technical sense. It certainly conferred what was apparently the outward mark of nobilitas, namely the 'jus imaginum,' or the right to have the waxen masks of ancestors who had held public office carried in funeral processions. The old opposition between patrician and plebeian gave way to that between the nobiles and the 'new man.' Livy puts

into the mouth of a demagogue of the Hannibalic war the words 'there will be no end to the war until we have a really plebeian consul, that is to say, a new man; for the plebeian nobles have been initiated into the old mysteries and despise the plebs since the day when they ceased to be despised by the patricians.'

The methods of the new oligarchy are worthy of examination. Not only was entrance to the charmed circle carefully guarded, but, so far as possible, the career of the individual was made to conform to type, and the acquisition of exceptional power or influence prevented. Livy mentions as a democratic measure the proposal of a tribune made in 342 B.C. that no magistracy might be held a second time until ten years had elapsed; but if this rule was really laid down so early, it was not observed in practice, though this might be partly accounted for by the exigencies of the Samnite wars. The censorship, however, was only once held for a second time, after an interval of almost thirty years (294-265 B.C.), and the holder then passed a law forbidding re-election entirely. The rule of the ten-year interval had to be suspended during the Hannibalic war, when a law was passed (217 B.C.) that 'so long as the war in Italy continued, the people should have the right to re-elect consuls as many and as often as it pleased'; but it was revived after the danger had passed, and was observed until M. Claudius Marcellus was elected to a third consulship three years after his second.

The order of the several magistracies, and the rules as to the age of candidates, which for a long time were a matter of custom, also became fixed during the period of oligarchical government. The career of a

Roman statesman began with the quaestorship, which was a stepping-stone to the higher offices; but it would have been impossible to require the holding of both aedileship and praetorship as a necessary qualification for the consulship, if the supply of candidates was to be maintained. There was, however, a generally observed rule that a full year's interval should elapse between the holding of one office and the

next, the object of which was to secure that opportunity should be given for calling to account one who had been guilty of maladministration.

In 180 B.C. a *Lex Annalis* was passed by one Villius, the object of which was to determine age-limits for the various magistracies; and the minimum ages were so fixed that a two-year interval elapsed between each step in the office-holder's career. It would seem that the quaestorship might be held at 27, the aedileship or praetorship at 33, the consulship at 36; but these conditions must have been altered at some later date, since Cicero speaks of 33, the age at which Alexander the Great died, as 'ten years lower than that which our laws allow for a consul'; and later practice confirms him.

The measures taken with regard to the government of the overseas dependencies of Rome are of still greater importance. The defeat of Carthage in the First Punic War brought the islands of Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica under

How provinces  
were governed

Roman rule. It was clearly impossible to provide for their administration without increasing the number of those qualified to exercise imperium, and the supreme college of praetors was accordingly increased by two, one for Sicily and the other for the remaining islands. In the Second Punic War Rome was forced to include Spain in her dominions, and the peninsula was divided into two districts, to administer which two further praetors were created. These commands were termed 'provinciae,' a name which had the general sense of 'department,' and was so applied to the spheres of activity assigned to the city magistrates. Now it is a remarkable fact that for the half-century which followed there were no further annexations, although Rome waged two successful wars, one against the Macedonian kingdom and one against the Seleucid Empire of Antiochus the Great: nor was any attempt made to establish a land connexion between Spain and Italy. It would seem that the senatorial oligarchy was actuated in this anti-imperialistic policy by two motives—jealousy of the power of military governors over whom it was difficult to exercise any effective control, and dislike of the

constitutional guarantees of life and liberty and declare a state of war in Rome by what Caesar calls 'the ultimate decree.'

Where powers so great were exercised it was proper that strict forms of procedure should be observed. Thus a body of usage was gradually formed corresponding with the standing orders of modern deliberative assemblies. Just as the right of 'dealing with the people,' or plebs, i.e. the initiative in legislation, was carefully hedged about, so the right of convening the Senate was restricted to the magistrates of the people (excluding the censors) and to the tribunes, at any rate from the date (which is unknown) when they acquired seats in that body. Again, just as the people could only express its will in response to a definite question submitted to it,

**Form and usage** so the Senate could only  
**in the Senate** pass a valid decree  
(*'senatus consultum'*) in  
response to a definite question formally  
submitted by the convener. The decree  
was subject to the tribune's veto, and if  
this were exercised it ranked merely as  
an *'auctoritas'*—a recommendation re-  
corded in the minutes. If, however, the  
Senate felt strongly on the matter at issue,  
it could and often did instruct the consuls  
to bring pressure on the tribunes, and  
this usually sufficed to end the deadlock.

Thus Rome in the middle Republic evolved an organ of government which conducted its deliberations with a dignity and order which have been sadly to seek in some modern parliaments, and which gave Roman policy the continuous and long predetermined direction, free from the disturbing influences of party strife and compromise, which helped to gather the fruits of the victories won by the incomparable valour of her citizen armies. It cannot be said, however, that the Senate was alive to the wider issues which were raised when Rome became supreme, first in Italy and then in the Mediterranean world. No doubt it is easy for us to be wise after the event, and to lay cheap blame on the Romans for failing to grasp the ideas of representative government and the devolution of power; the rapid growth of their empire made it inevitable for them to have recourse to makeshifts and to take the line of least resistance.

Still, it is necessary to indicate what were the problems to be solved.

In the first place, although the sovereignty of the people was an admitted principle of the constitution, the archaic methods by which it continued to find expression remained in use until they were swept away by the monarchical system of the Emperors. The Romans were proud of their well-drilled Assembly, shown to be an army in posse by its marshalled ranks and its standing to hear the utterance of the magistrate, while Greek democratic assemblies lolled in their seats, as Cicero contemptuously reminds his hearers. But this Assembly, as Roman citizenship spread, ceased in any way to represent effectively the Roman people. The system of the group-vote made the tribe the counterpart of the modern constituency for electoral purposes. But the list of tribes was closed in 241 B.C. and communities or individuals who received the franchise after that date must perforce be enrolled in one of those already existing. Thus a 'tribe' became, territorially speaking, a scattered group of communities (with a nucleus not far from Rome), while for voting purposes, since membership was hereditary, a number of its members were not resident in any of its areas; and it must have been rare indeed for out-voters to make their way to Rome for the exercise of the suffrage. Great as was the assimilative power of Rome, the wider her net was flung, the more unrepresentative became the assemblies in Forum and Field of Mars.

In the matter of local self-government the world does indeed owe a debt to the Romans, since in the closing century of the Republic and the earlier period of the Empire a municipal system was called into being. But in the days of the Senate's ascendancy Rome had not yet been forced to tackle this question. It has been explained in a previous chapter (Chap. 53) how the conquest of Italy had been furthered by the policy of establishing colonies at important strategical points. The so-called 'Latin' colonies, from the fact that they were assimilated in status to the members of the old Latin league,

remained technically sovereign states bound to Rome by a treaty relation, and were left to develop their own institutions. The 'colonies of Roman citizens' were at first mere garrisons, and were as such placed under military rule; but as time went on, it was found necessary to issue charters which gave them some measure of self-government, with two chief magistrates (copied from the Roman consulate) and a local senate and assembly; and the 'Latin' foundations no doubt copied the main features of the type, though there were local variations — for example Beneventum, founded as a Latin colony in 268 B.C., modelled its constitution very closely on that of Rome, even using the title of consul for its chief magistrates.

The municipia of half-citizens, which gradually attained to full Roman rights, showed some variety in their institutions; there was for instance a college of three 'aediles' at Tusculum, Arpinum and other towns; but the common practice was to vest the powers of the magistracy in a board of four ('quattuorviri'). This so far prevailed amongst towns (other than colonies) of Roman right that when in Caesar's time a rumour was spread by his enemies that he had ordered the towns of Cisalpine Gaul 'to elect quattuorviri,' this was taken to imply that he had assumed the right to make their inhabitants full citizens of Rome. We have not the means of tracing in detail the spread of Roman political ideas outside the limits of the colonies and municipia, but it is noteworthy that an inscription in the Oscan dialect from the Lucanian town of Bantia, which belongs apparently to the latter part of the second century B.C., shows that Roman titles such as tribune and censor were borrowed and a 'cursus honorum' set up on the Roman model.

Thus the way was being paved for the extension of the Roman type of urban government to the whole of Italy, without the active intervention of the central authority. The Senate, in fact, was blind to the conception of a unified and Romanised Italy, and after 180 B.C. no further avenues to incorporation in the Roman state were opened. The bulk of the Italian communities remained



IDEAL OF THE ROMAN MAGISTRATE

The dignified appearance of the magistrates as they stepped forward, clad in the stately Roman toga, to address the comitia may be gathered from this life-size statue of late Republican times, now in Sion House.


From Poulsen, 'Greek & Roman Portraits,' Clarendon Press

allies ('socii') of Rome, but this honourable title concealed a variety of status. A few favoured communities, such as the ancient Latin towns of Tibur and Praeneste, or the Greek cities of the south, Neapolis and Heraclea, enjoyed an 'equal treaty' with Rome; and when, after the Social War, the franchise was bestowed upon all Italy, they were at first unwilling to accept it. But by far the greater number of Italian towns were bound to Rome by treaties which contained a clause expressly reserving suzerainty to Rome. This was capable of very wide interpretation, and in fact the oppressive assertion of Roman claims brought about growing discontent, which culminated in the agitation fostered by the Gracchi and their successors and the Social War.

It remains to cast an eye over the extra-Italian possessions of Rome. Here too we



find much variety of status. On coming into contact with the Greek world, Rome became acquainted with more elastic relationships between states, monarchical or self-governed, than those which had become stereotyped in Italy. Alliances for a term of years and without specified obligations in respect of military service, treaties of 'friendship,' agreements for neutrality, and so forth, were common in the Hellenistic sphere, and Rome had to adapt her methods to the habits of kings and peoples. But there was a gradual tightening of the bonds, and though the title 'socii' might be in use, it became a mere term of courtesy for 'subjects.' Few were the cities which enjoyed equal treaty rights with Rome, such as Rhodes, Gades (Cadiz), Messina (Messina) and Massilia (Marseilles). In these the Roman magistrate exercised no imperium and the local laws were administered by local authority.



#### ROMAN DECREE OF FREEDOM

'Freedom' in Roman foreign policy meant the enjoyment of privileges revocable at any moment. Thus this decree of L. Aemilius Paulus (praetor in Spain, 189 B.C.), freeing the Lascutani from the Hastenses, concludes, 'while it be the pleasure of the Roman People and Senate.'

No permanent taxation or tribute was levied upon them, but in some cases a specific service might be required, as of Messina, which agreed to supply a guardship and police the straits. Corn for the Roman armies might be requisitioned, but at a fixed price.

A less highly favoured, but more numerous, class was that of the free states ('liberae civitates'), which enjoyed privileges very similar in substance to those of the allied communities, but held them only on sufferance by a revocable grant. Thus an inscription of the second century B.C. records the concession of

'freedom' by a Roman commander to certain Spanish tribesmen, to hold good 'so long as it be the pleasure of the People and Senate of Rome.' Specific immunities, again, might be limited by a saving clause. This is best illustrated by a document which, though it belongs to the first century B.C., reproduces the features of earlier charters. It is a law by which the status of 'libertas' is conferred upon the Pisidian town of Termessus in reward for services rendered to Rome in the Mithradatic war. It provides that no Roman troops shall be billeted on the town, 'except in accordance with a special decree of the Senate'; and that the people of Termessus shall have the right to levy customs duties at their pleasure, 'provided that no such duties shall be payable by the tax-farmers who have entered into contracts with the Roman people.' In a case mentioned by Livy, belonging to the second century B.C., the exemption extends to all Romans and Latir allies.

Such grants imply that the community which received them had placed itself in a position of dependence, and the act by which it did so might be one of unconditional surrender, or it might be decorously veiled under high-sounding phrases such as 'entering into friendship' with or 'entrusting themselves to the good faith' of the Roman people.

The potentates who were drawn into relation with Rome were treated in a similar spirit, though the tightening of the reins was more gradual. 'Friendship and alliance' (in the Greek form) was the starting-point of a relationship in which the influence of Rome as the predominant partner grew in strength until the kingdom became a protectorate. This system of client principalities developed rapidly in the period of the great conquests, which is studied in Chronicle X and Chapter 65. In the period with which we are dealing the Romans had not yet formed the conception of a world empire, still less had they considered how the constitution which served the purpose of a city state with a predominantly military genius could be adapted to the purposes of such a dominion.

# SOCIAL LIFE UNDER THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

How the Citizens of Rome and the Italians of Town and Country Fared in pre-Imperial Times

By F. H. MARSHALL

Koraes Professor of Byzantine History, King's College, London;  
Author of *Discovery in Greek Lands*, etc.

**T**HOUGH this study mainly concerns social life in Italy and Rome in the century which falls between the time of the Gracchi (tribunes in 133, 123 and 122 B.C.) and the battle of Actium (31 B.C.), it is impossible to leave out of account the social development of Italy in the preceding centuries. Rome presents those changes involved in the progress of a community from a small agricultural state to a far-flung empire with a highly developed city life.

Our information as to social conditions in the Ciceronian period is incomparably fuller than that relating to the preceding centuries, and on this account it is inevitable that a picture of Roman social life should mainly illustrate the manners of the closing years of the Republic. Nevertheless, such a picture, if deprived of its historical background, would certainly give a false view of Roman society as a whole. It is, therefore, an indispensable corrective to preface a detailed account of social conditions in the time of Cicero by a sketch of the main changes through which Roman society passed in the long course of the Republic's history.


It is convenient to make the shattering experiences of the Hannibalic war a dividing line, and to trace the progress of Roman social conditions before and after that great war. It is not a far-fetched comparison to find in the changes which ensued in Italy after the war with Hannibal an analogy to the changes which have taken place in England and other countries after the Great War.

The basis of the Roman state before, as after, the Hannibalic war was the household, and the rule of its head, the

paterfamilias, over its members was absolute. It was from the household that the clans (gentes) were derived; these bore the names of the oldest families, such as the Aemilii and Claudii, and from these clans the Rustic Tribes derived their names. Early Rome must, therefore, be regarded as consisting of a number of clans, first settled on the Palatine and then spreading gradually over the adjacent hills. Their political organization was based on the family. The king was the father of the community, and was elected by that community for life. The groups of families or clans were distributed in wards, known as curiae, which composed the popular assembly, and the consent of that assembly was necessary before the king could change the laws.

Besides the popular assembly there was a Senate chosen by the king to act as a kind of state council, but from the first the real sovereignty lay with the people, the original clan settlers. The army was also organized on a clan basis. Thus the main rights and duties of these original clan members, who came to form the patricians, were the appointment of a king, the ratification of the laws, and service in the army. To this original state organization the Romans clung with great tenacity, and this explains the weight attached by men of the old school, like Cato the Censor, to the 'customs of our ancestors,' the 'mos majorum.'

From the economic standpoint, each clan may be pictured as possessing its own land, working it, and dividing the produce amongst the various families. But several



### PLAN OF REPUBLICAN ROME

From the original Roma Quadrata of Romulus Rome grew by the sixth century B.C. to the area enclosed within the Servian wall, traced in black above. Thereafter it spread, though quite unsystematically, over the Campus Martius to the Tiber.

causes tended to modify this original arrangement. As the result of successful warfare the community gained fresh lands, and the king would reward prominent individuals with grants from the land thus won, nominally as a loan which could in theory be recalled; pastoral land also was let out for grazing purposes on payment of a rent called 'scriptura.' Rome and its outlying districts were thus divided into a number of small farms and pasture lands, in part used jointly by members of a clan, in part by individual families, with the result that, at the time of the reorganization known as the Servian Constitution, military service became based on the possession of land, and taxation was adjusted accordingly. From this reform sprang the chief popular assembly, the Comitia Centuriata (see page 1796).

Hitherto only the full Roman citizens, the patricians, have been considered. Side by side with them, however, there grew up a class destined to play a most important part in Roman history, the plebeians. As to their origin we must rely largely on conjecture, though some measure of confidence can be felt concerning its main character. No community can remain

rigidly exclusive. War captives were sometimes freed; immigrants came to join the first settlers. These 'out-landers' were not possessed of citizen rights; they were neither members of the popular assemblies nor served in the Roman armies. Gradually they acquired land, and in many instances amassed wealth, but politically they were dependent on the protection of the original patrician citizens, and were thus known as clients. As time went on they were merged in the great class of plebeians.

The political and economic conditions of the earliest Roman community, as thus outlined, contain the germs of the chief social problems which were to vex the Roman state in the course of its development. There is the problem of the social position of those outside the patrician circle, and the problem of the land. Though the former was solved under the Republic, the latter was found incapable of solution.

The overthrow of the monarchy did not change the essential features of Roman life. The king's powers passed into the hands of two annually elected consuls, and this original imperium was gradually put more and more into commission, though the full powers were occasionally revived for a period of six months by the creation of a dictator. The chief popular assembly, the Comitia Centuriata, elected the consuls and other magistrates, and adopted or rejected laws, while the Senate confirmed or threw out these resolutions.

The character of the assembly changed in so far as the plebeians, who had assisted in the revolution, gained the right of voting, but this gain did not satisfy them, for they hankered after official posts. On the other hand the patricians held tightly to their privileges, and became more grasping in other directions. They drew into their hands most of the public lands acquired in the course of ever extending conquests, and annexed most of the grazing lands without paying the state its dues, while admitting a few of the richer plebeians to share their spoils. These growing estates began to be worked by the labour of slaves captured in war.

Such were the grievances—exclusion from office, a harsh law of debt, and the oppression of the small farmer—which led to the fierce struggles between the patricians and the plebeians, struggles which continued till the equalisation of the orders in 287 B.C. The famous Tribune of the Plebs was created to match two annually elected plebeian officials against the two patrician consuls, but this office in the course of time entirely changed its character, and was ultimately turned by the aristocracy into a weapon to suit its own ends. A detailed account of the struggle between the orders belongs to Roman political history, and has been given in Chapter 55; from the social aspect, however, two points must be stressed.

By the period immediately preceding the Hannibalic war the social gulf between patricians and plebeians was practically bridged over, for the wealthier plebeians had obtained access to all official posts. On the other hand, despite repeated legislative enactments, the agrarian question remained as acute as ever. Wealth had grown with the conquest of most of Italy, and the small farmer was still fighting for existence against the competition of large estates, now to a great extent worked by slave labour for the benefit of wealthy capitalists. Nominally, the popular assemblies still had control of politics, and even interfered occasionally in military affairs, but in reality the difficulties of attendance owing to the distance of most of the farms from Rome made their powers ineffectual.

The Senate was beginning to draw the conduct of affairs into its hands, for its composition and permanence gave it great advantages.

#### Essential Aristocracy of the Senate


The censors had been directed by law to elect into it 'the best from every rank,' an instruction which in practice meant that they enrolled, as a rule, ex-magistrates. Thus the Senate became a life-body comprising the chief experience of the state, and this body, composed in the main of an aristocracy of wealth, gradually drew into its hands the control of legislation, by compelling magistrates to submit measures for its approval, by defining the extent of these

magistrates' activity, both during their actual office and the period of its extension, and by controlling all public business of importance in war and finance. Such were the political and social conditions when Rome, towards the end of the third century B.C., had to carry on her life-and-death struggle with Carthage.

Despite the social changes just described, the armies which frustrated Hannibal were still for the most part composed of Roman farmers, and the character of the Italian people had been little influenced by foreign manners. But **Changes effected by the Punic Wars** now a new factor was introduced with the advent of overseas possessions. As the result of the first Punic War Sicily and Sardinia had become Roman provinces; the second added the two Spains, and furthermore opened out an unending vista of problems in the East. For an understanding of the social conditions of the Ciceronian age, with which we are primarily concerned, it is essential to indicate, however briefly, the changes in society following the mighty war with Carthage.

The aristocracy of wealth had emerged as a whole with enhanced credit from that struggle, and prominent families like the Corneli and Valerii began to put forward a kind of hereditary claim to a magisterial and senatorial career. Proud of their external decorations, the gold ring, the tunic with the broad purple stripe, and their halls filled with waxen portraits of their ancestors, they regarded themselves as the heaven-sent rulers of the Roman state at home and abroad. Their influence extended, through the censorship, over the composition of the order next below them, the knights, and through the knights over the voting powers of the popular assembly.

The citizen body had suffered serious diminution through the ravages of the Hannibalic war, and this loss was not made up by admitting to the franchise the Latin and Italian allies. Indeed, many of the complaints which were to give rise to the Social War a century later date from this time—the unfair burdens placed upon the allies in war, their meagre rewards, their scant prospect of obtaining



SIMPLE LIFE IN RURAL ITALY

This admirably modelled relief depicting a farm labourer with his cow dates from the Augustan period. It gives a realistic picture of conditions, then passing away, when small holdings averaging perhaps a hundred and fifty acres were the rule and the personal touch was dominant in rural life.

Munich Glyptothek; photo, G. Pattendorfer

Roman citizenship. Those Italians who had sided with Hannibal, notably the Bruttians in the extreme south of the peninsula, were reduced to a condition of serfdom, and provided excellent material for prospective slave risings.

The acquisition of provinces raised entirely new problems. Our concern is primarily with the social changes involved, but these cannot be separated from the economic. In the first place, Rome took over the Carthaginian system, which carried with it payment of tribute, chiefly in kind. In theory this tribute was to cover the cost of administration; in reality it too often served to enrich unscrupulous individuals. The governors had full military, administrative and judicial powers, and everything depended on their personal character. As they were unpaid, it could scarcely be expected that in the long run such officials, practically irresponsible as they were, would not abuse their powers. Free quarters, grain requisitions, requisitions for the public shows at Rome, and other exactions, such

as those detailed by Cicero in his speeches against Verres, were among the burdens laid, with ever increasing unscrupulousness, by governors upon the lands under their control.

Matters were even worse in the Eastern provinces, as these were gradually acquired by the Republic. The only remedy lay in the prosecution of the offender before a jury chosen from his own class, and a conviction could be secured only in the most flagrant instances. Ill-gotten gains are ill-spent, and it cannot be doubted that the provincial system, combined with the huge war indemnities exacted from Carthage, Antiochus of Asia and Perseus of Macedon, contributed much to the social changes now to be described.

Rome and Italy displayed after the Hannibalic war instructive post-war symptoms. Prominent amongst these are

the worship paid to wealth, the dying-out of the middle classes, the growth of a city rabble, an increase of slave labour, a craving for amusements and luxury, an increased emancipation of women, the influx of oriental worships, and the marked importance of banking and money-lending. Not a few of these changes were due to the revolution which took place in Italian agriculture.

The typical old Roman farm as described by Cato the Censor was of small extent, perhaps some 150 acres. The proprietor generally looked after his own estate, with the aid of a slave bailiff and about a dozen slave hands, and all lived together in the farm-buildings. A larger proprietor might own several small farms of this character, where grain, vegetables, the olive and the vine were the principal objects of cultivation. The stock might include some oxen for ploughing and a few sheep and pigs. How could corn grown on this small scale compete with great grain-

Conditions of the  
small holder

producing provinces like Sicily, Sardinia and Africa? There were no protective duties and prices were kept artificially low to meet the city's needs. Thus it was that the small holders who had formed the backbone of the armies which repelled Hannibal were squeezed out, and their farms merged in the capitalists' large estates, which were used principally for the purpose of grazing and for the production of wine and oil on a large scale. These estates were worked mainly by slaves, and became those 'latifundia' which, as the elder Pliny afterwards said, proved the ruin of Italy. The system was encouraged by the precarious tenure of state lands which offered no inducement to the lessee to sink much capital in improving the soil.

The decay of agriculture and the flocking of ruined farmers to Rome was an important factor in producing social change, but it was only one of many factors at work. Rome, with the new sources of wealth already mentioned, became, like London, the money market of the world, and in it the great mercantile associations had their headquarters. The senatorial order was by law excluded from direct participation in commercial transactions; hence Senators had to find employment for their money indirectly in investments, and it was in this way that the great capitalist order, the equestrian, rose into prominence.

The opportunities for the capitalist in Rome were immense. The bankers carried out all kinds of money-lending business, and had branches in all parts of the provinces. All contracts, state as well as

private, were carried out through agents, whether bankers or associations of capitalists. The best-known example is that of the contractors for the collection of the provincial taxes, a practice fraught, it is true, with consequences of immeasurable evil to Roman society, but at the same time only a prominent example of the numerous mercantile activities of associations of Roman citizens. The instruments of all these associations were mainly slaves, and thus was bred a vast class of expert slaves, the forefathers of the upstart freedmen destined to bulk so largely in the society of Imperial Rome. Only a small portion of the free population would be absorbed by the trades necessary for a large city.


Some instances of the social changes which accompanied this economic revolution may be given. The craving for amusements grew apace, and it is in this second century before Christ that the great public games were increased in length and multiplied in number. Private games also became more frequent, and they began to include new features. Chariot racing had been in vogue before this period, but wild beast baiting was a new item. Gladiators, first



STOCK AND IMPLEMENTS OF A COUNTRY FARMSTEAD

From a quite early period Italy was a prosperous agricultural country, producing grain and fine wool and, in the central and northern regions, breeding stock, mainly pigs and sheep. Methods long remained primitive. These bronze figurines give a complete picture of the stock and implements of a country farmstead: the 'joined' plough drawn by two bullocks, the crude wagon—merely a platform with front board and tail board mounted on solid wheels—and pigs, sheep and goats.

*Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York*



#### CRUEL SPORT THAT THRILLED THE ROMAN POPULACE

The amphitheatre at Pompeii was built about 75 B.C. near the city walls, with seating accommodation for 15,000 spectators. Gladiators fought with short swords, with net and trident, with lances, with nooses, in full armour and even blindfolded. The fate of a vanquished gladiator depended on the caprice of the audience, who signified by upturned thumbs or by waving handkerchiefs whether he should be dispatched or spared. The dead or dying were dragged with hooks from the arena.

introduced in the preceding century, became more common, and spread even to the Syrian Greeks. It is in this century that the adaptations of Greek plays, familiar to us through Plautus and Terence, first came into vogue, though they were never really popular with the rough Roman audiences. A great increase of luxury in dress, ornaments and buildings is to be noted. Women, who contracted sham marriages to escape from tutelage, became rich and independent, and fought hard to free themselves from rules limiting expenditure on personal adornment. Table luxuries brought from the nearer East became a marked feature of banquets, and the business of the caterer flourished. Just as Greek philosophic theories and Greek literature penetrated Roman society, so Greek wines and Greek fashions in wine-drinking grew popular.

The attitude of strict Romans of the old school towards these innovations is typified by Cato the Censor. Probably no



THE STABIAN BATHS AT POMPEII

The reconstruction (top) is a trustworthy representation of the Stabian Baths while they were still intact and gay with the brilliant exterior mural paintings that were a characteristic feature of Pompeii. The visit to the Baths was an integral part of the daily life of every Roman of the leisured class.



ITALY'S OLDEST AMPHITHEATRE

Outside staircases led to the upper galleries of the amphitheatre at Pompeii, and rising circles of seats were supported on arcades. This amphitheatre is the most ancient in Italy.

community has undergone so sudden a revolution in manners as that of Rome in the second century before Christ. We can but dimly picture to ourselves the indignation of a Cato by listening to the strictures of a survivor from the Victorian era upon present-day manners. Mommsen sums up the situation in a striking sentence. 'If we can conceive of England with its lords, its squires, and above all its City, but with its freeholders and lessees converted into proletarians, and its labourers and sailors into slaves, we shall gain an approximate image of the population of the Italian peninsula in these days.

The ever-increasing gulf between rich and poor, the absence of a solid middle class, the gross abuses of power by the governing aristocracy and their incompetence when faced with external danger, were the factors which produced the revolution of the next century. The dangers were foreseen by statesmen, and a democratic party arose which sought to counteract the chief evils. Tiberius and



Gaius Gracchus tried to restore Italian agriculture by the creation of small holdings, the encouragement of free labour, the founding of colonies both at home and overseas, and by the inclusion of non-citizens in these schemes. But such reforms embraced the undesirable features of the distribution of cheap corn to the proletariat and the raising of the capitalist class as a counterpoise to the aristocracy.

Marius created a standing and professional as opposed to a citizen army, and thereby gave ambitious generals the opportunity of winning independent and tyrannical power, such as that acquired by Sulla. The widening of the franchise as the result of the Social War increased the material for the exercise of bribery and intrigue at the elections. Sulla himself, as dictator, endeavoured to give the aristocratic party a new lease of life by his legislation, but only demonstrated its incompetence, facilitating the career of a Verres, the insolent triumph of a Spartacus, with his slaves and gladiators in Italy, and of the pirate hordes in the Mediterranean. The domination of a Pompey or a Caesar became inevitable.

We are thus brought to the period assigned for a more detailed study of Roman social life, and are in a position to understand its leading features. The



#### CONVERTING MUST INTO 'DEFRUTUM'

*Must*—that is, new wine—was partly used for drinking as soon as ready, partly decocted into a jelly form ('defrutum'), and partly stored in casks in cellars. This relief shows its decoction into defrutum; two men are attending to a cauldron on a fire, and another with an amphora is filling a second cauldron.

*British Museum*

seeds sown at the different epochs of the Republic have now produced full growth, and this is what makes a study of the social conditions of the Ciceronian age so exceptionally interesting. What follows deals rather with the character of the various classes composing Roman society than with the external and what may be called archaeological aspects. These are better reserved for treatment under the life of Imperial Rome (see Chap. 71).

The picture of social conditions in the Ciceronian age is best presented by delineating the character and pursuits of the chief classes of the population at Rome. The Senatorial order included both old families and those families which had more recently won their way to office. The latter were characteristically called 'new men,' and were looked down upon to some extent by members of old clans like the Aemilii and Corneli. All alike, however, wore the Senatorial tunic with the broad purple stripe, and it is hardly surprising that these aristocrats—'best men,' as they called themselves—found it hard to agree on any policy save that of clinging to their lucrative official posts and resisting democratic innovators. Hence Cicero's frequently uncomfortable position as a 'new man' himself, and his futile policy of harmonising the Senatorial and capitalistic orders.

What an unhappy family these aristocrats formed in the hour of crisis is vividly portrayed by Caesar in his grim description of the imaginary division of the spoils of Pompey's followers before the battle of Pharsalus. 'All were occupied,' he says, 'in discussing their own prospective offices or pecuniary rewards, or in prosecuting their private enmities, and were absorbed,



#### DUEL TO THE DEATH

There were several specific classes of gladiators. This Etruscan urn painting shows a 'mirmillo,' armed like the Gauls (left), matched with a 'thrax,' armed like the Thracians with round shield, greaves on both legs and curved sword.

*From 'I Rilievi delle Urne Etrusche'*

not in devising means to secure their victory, but in discussing the manner in which they ought to use that victory'—a not unfair picture of the mentality of the average aristocrat of Cicero's day. The Roman noble could never free his mind of the idea that the spoils were his by right of descent rather than of personal effort. That was why an aristocrat like Caesar who tried to remedy the evils of his times was looked upon by his order as a monstrosity, and mistrusted even by intelligent conservatives like Cicero.


In manners these aristocrats were cultivated and polite. Greek literature had greatly influenced the upper classes

since the days of the Scipionic circle. The best type of aristocrat would be, in Cicero's phrase, 'a man of the greatest common sense, good education, wide experience and also politeness, which, as the Stoics most rightly think, is a virtue.' Stoicism coupled with boorishness, as exemplified in the younger Cato, would be a rare exception. A man like the great jurist, Servilius Sulpicius Rufus, would approximate to Cicero's ideal. Yet it must be noted that in public life, particularly that connected with the Bar, which, apart from their administrative career, was the chief occupation of the abler men, a tone of personal abuse was fashionable—



#### LUXURY IN A ROMAN HOME OF THE SECOND CENTURY B.C.

How palatial domestic architecture became in the second century B.C. is indicated by the ruins of the House of the Faun—so-called from a bronze statuette found in it—at Pompeii. It comprised an atrium, or large reception room—here shown as it is and reconstructed—a tablinum or sitting-room behind, and two large colonnaded courts, with a number of other living rooms. Exquisite mosaics adorned the floors, and the walls were decorated with stucco imitation of coloured marbles.



#### HOW PROVINCIAL ITALIANS LIVED AT POMPEII BEFORE ITS BURIAL IN THE VOLCANIC DUST OF VESUVIUS

What apparently was the largest of all the private houses in Pompeii was that known as the House of Pansa. It has been reconstructed in the form of the model shown above. The house, which must certainly have accommodated a considerable number of separate families, was a three-storied villa of remarkably modern appearance. It stood on an island site 319 feet long by 124 feet wide and along both sides ground-floor rooms were let off by the proprietor as shops. At one end was a garden court with statues, flower beds, and a fountain.

*Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York*

abuse far exceeding in bitterness anything which is allowed to-day. Cicero's speeches, for all their eloquence, do not give a favourable impression of Roman forensic oratory. Truth is suppressed and distorted, and full advantage is taken of the unsatisfactory character of the jury.

If a few aristocrats of superior character lived in accordance with the Stoic idea, there is much evidence to show that

was to wipe out the debit side of the account and to start afresh.

The order below the senatorial was the equestrian. This had passed through a strange transformation from the original cavalry group of the early Republic from which it derived its name. It had come, as we have seen, to represent the banking classes at Rome; that there was great scope for the financial activities of its



SUMPTUOUS COUNTRY VILLA OF A WEALTHY ROMAN

Pliny's elaborate descriptions of his Laurentine and Tuscan villas could have been matched by many a wealthy Roman of late republican times. This wall painting from the sitting-room of Lucius Frons's house at Pompeii gives the front view of a delightful country seat in Campania. In the centre a round temple-pavilion with a cupola gives access to the atrium, and two-storied porticoes on the flanks contain a lawn with flower beds; a spacious park stretches behind the villa.

*From Rodenburgh, in Jahrbuch der deutschen archaologischen Instituts.*

the coarser side of Epicureanism appealed to a large and irresponsible section. Of the prevalent immorality something will be said in connexion with the women of the time. But wealth and ease tempted many a younger member of the senatorial order to regard life as an opportunity for indulging in a round of pleasure. Hence the average attendance at the Senate was bad, and matters of public importance were treated with unbecoming levity and haste. In this atmosphere the more active spirits among the men became of a restless and disturbing type, like Catiline, Curio and Marcus Caelius Rufus, who were equally ready to fall under the influence of a Clodia, or to threaten the stability of the state. In literature the type is represented by Catullus and his school. Able and unprincipled, these men amassed mountains of debt, and their only idea of politics

members has been already indicated. The qualification for admission to the order was the possession of a capital representing some £4000, but such a sum gives no idea of the wealth of the average knight.

The class played an important part in Roman history because of its wealth and wide business ramifications, and in the last century of the Republic had the championship of Cicero. Rising politicians sought the aid of the knights, because they could accommodate them with the loans necessary to pay for the giving of shows and the free distributions of grain indispensable for the bribing of electors. The equestrian banker would thus help a Caesar to the aedileship or a Cicero to build his town and country house, hire a body of gladiators as a commercial speculation, or lend money to impoverished Greek cities. Never has the interdepend-

ence of wealth and politics been better shown than in the first century before Christ. It explains the rise of a mediocrity like Crassus, who, as representing the moneyed classes, was necessary to a Caesar. A more pleasing member of this order is to be found in Cicero's friend and correspondent Atticus, who, while himself holding aloof from politics, was able to give politicians sound advice.

of the tithes of Sicily and Asia Minor. The censors let out the contracts, and for these the associations of knights known as publicans paid a lump sum, recouping themselves in the provinces as best they might. It must be borne in mind that these associations resembled joint-stock companies with directors and shareholders; but whereas we ourselves only occasionally hear of political scandals



#### UNATTRACTIVE PATRICIANS OF THE LATER REPUBLICAN AGE

Roman aristocrats, though cultivated and polite, had some rather unlovely characteristics. Thus a distinct grumness is written in the physiognomy of the unidentified elderly man and woman (right) above. Nor is graciousness the dominant quality in the portrait of Servilia (left). Yet this great lady was married twice and, with a moral laxity also common to her class, was the mistress of Julius Caesar, who shared with her first husband, M. Junius Brutus, the reputed paternity of her son.


Ny Carlsberg, Copenhagen, and Berlin Museum.

The equestrian order occupied an important position as jurymen. Sulla had temporarily excluded them from the service, thereby reversing the law of Gaius Gracchus. By the Aurelian law of 70 B.C. a compromise was effected, by which one-third of the jurymen for criminal cases was drawn from the senatorial, and two-thirds from the equestrian order, though one of these two-thirds belonged to a special class of (apparently) a slightly lower capital rating. The social effect of this was to favour the business dealings of the capitalists and to enable them to squeeze the provincials very effectively.

They had full opportunity, thanks to the system of contracting for the collection

connected with business dealings, at Rome public contracts were intimately bound up with political life. It requires little imagination to realize the disastrous effect of this system on public morality. Even a well-intentioned governor could not resist the depredations of the tax-gatherer when he was liable to be tried by a jury of men two-thirds of whom belonged to the class to which the tax-gatherer belonged.

Cicero, a well-intentioned man, found his moral fibre all too weak to withstand such a system. In a letter of 61 B.C., written to Atticus after Pompey's victorious settlement of the East—and it should be mentioned that Pompey's appointment had been urged by Cicero in the interests



#### COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY IN ITALY DURING THE FIRST CENTURY B.C.

The upper of these two panels depicts the interior of a shop devoted to the sale of belts and pillows. Under the eye of the shopkeeper two assistants are opening a box containing a pillow for the inspection of the seated customers, a man and a woman, behind whom their attendant slaves are standing. The lower panel shows two customers, or perhaps the owners of a factory, inspecting a sample of cloth displayed before them by two members of their staff.

*Uffizi Gallery, Florence. Photos, Alinari*

of the publicans—he bewails the growing disunion between the senatorial and equestrian orders:


Those who entered into contract with the censors for the farming of the taxes of Asia have complained in the Senate that they were carried away by their eagerness, and paid too high a price for the contract; they have requested its cancellation. I have been their leader, or rather their second, for it was Crassus who egged them on to make this daring request. It is a nasty business, and the request is a disgraceful one and an open admission of precipitancy.

In his speech of 56 B.C. 'On the Consular Provinces,' Cicero charges Gabinius 'with having handed over the unhappy publicans to enslavement by Jews and Syrians, peoples themselves born to servitude.' The truth is that Gabinius, who was no friend to the tax-farmers, tried to protect the provincials from their extortion. These passages give an instructive insight into the political wire-pulling which went on at Rome in connexion with the farming of taxes, and reveal the hopeless plight of the provincials.

We now descend in the social scale to the mass of Roman citizens, the 'plebs urbana,' and consider their daily pursuits. These are much harder to determine than

those of the senatorial and equestrian orders. The plebs included men engaged in a great variety of occupations, and care must be taken not to picture them as merely a base rabble interested in nothing except the selling of their votes and the enjoyment of cheap corn and amusements. They lived for the most part in blocks of tenement buildings called 'insulae' described in the chapter (Chap. 71) which deals with the social life of Imperial Rome. The low-lying districts between the hills were the principal haunts of the common people, and certain quarters in these were devoted to particular trades. The noisy Subura, for instance, was the home of small shopkeepers, the Argiletum of booksellers and shoemakers.

Inscriptions record the occupations of many free tradesmen and artisans. Too much is heard about the bad qualities, and too little about the good, in the case of the mass of the poorer population, in which without doubt could be found a great many of the humbler virtues. Occasionally an inscription is really illuminating, as when a tombstone of the first century in the British Museum (see page 1825) records in rude verse the mutual affection of a butcher from the Viminal



#### A WHOLESALE BAKERY BUSINESS IN REPUBLICAN ROME


Reliefs from the tomb of Eurysaces, shown opposite, depict various operations of the bakery trade. In the two lower strips the grain is being ground in mills by donkey power, rolled and kneaded and baked. The centre strip shows (right) the delivery of the bread to the magistrates, for whom Eurysaces worked on contract, and the top strip shows the weighing and dispatch of the loaves. The series forms a complete picture of a business concern of the period employing many hands.

*From Monumenta dell' Instituto*

Hill, named Aurelius Hermia, and his wife. The lines, unpolished as they are, form a pleasing contrast to those of a Catullus singing of his illicit amours with a Lesbia.

The lodging of the ordinary plebeian was undoubtedly a poor one, and these overcrowded 'islanders' might well need the kindly offices of a 'Good Goddess,' whom an inscription shows they sometimes worshipped. They were exposed to constant dangers from fire and collapse, and Crassus speculated with profit in these crazy buildings. In compensation, the plebeian had the benefit of a mild climate, which encouraged him to live, like the modern Italian, a great deal in the open. He had also the advantage, again enjoyed by his present-day descendants, of being able to subsist on a very modest amount of food. Bread and fruit would serve his main needs, while the peasant who lived in the country had his supply of cheese, honey, vegetables and fruit with perhaps, as in Ovid's famous account of Philemon and Baucis, an occasional slice of bacon. But in the aggregate the demands of the city population for grain involved a political problem of the first magnitude.

Gaius Gracchus, it has been seen, included the selling of cheap corn in his political programme, and the maintenance of the corn supply was always prominent in the minds of politicians. Most of the corn was imported from Sicily, Sardinia and Africa, and in this way another opportunity of fleecing the provincials was afforded to unscrupulous governors. It is enough to mention that the great Pompey in 57 B.C. sought the superintendence of the corn supply as likely to give him a power sufficient to counterbalance that of Caesar; and that Caesar himself, when he became master of the Roman world, found 320,000 people in receipt of free corn. When it is remem-



MEMORIAL TO A MASTER BAKER

This is the monument of Marcus Vergilius Eurysaces, baker and contractor; he was also an Apparitor—that is, a magistrate's clerk. So runs the inscription on this peculiar tomb in Rome, the shape, inscriptions and reliefs on which were designed to remind passers by of the dead man's occupation in life.

Photo, Altieri

bered that this large population had votes, it will be readily understood that the dole became an instrument of bribery. Caesar made a drastic reduction in the number of free recipients, and cut them down to 150,000; Augustus, who took over the corn supply himself, fixed the number at 200,000. Rough wine was cheap and abundant, and the aqueducts, though these were greatly extended under the Empire, afforded a fair water supply.

Though our information about the handicrafts and trades of Rome is scanty, it is known that from an early time the artisans had banded themselves together into trades unions or colleges, such as those of goldsmiths, fullers and bakers. These confined their activities, it would appear, to promoting the immediate interests of their trades, and seldom or never indulged in strikes. They were under the protection of a patron deity,



generally Minerva, and held periodic feasts. A pernicious development of such societies was that of political clubs, which became centres of intrigue and riot in this disturbed first century B.C., especially under the leadership of Clodius, and were sternly suppressed by Julius Caesar.

As a whole the plebs urbana acquired a very bad reputation in the closing years of the Republic. The policing of the city was very defective, and the old system under the aediles broke down completely, as is shown by the unparalleled scenes of disorder witnessed in Rome in the period immediately preceding the Civil War. The year of Clodius' tribunate (58) and the succeeding years saw pitched battles in Rome between the armed bands of Clodius and Milo. Cicero's house was burned down, and the



#### BALLOTING IN THE COMITIA


The ballot was introduced in 139 B.C. for the election of magistrates, and this coin shows an elector dropping his voting tablet into the ballot box.

*British Museum*

consuls actually shared the plunder. Amid this turmoil Pompey was helpless, and Rome resembled a battlefield rather than a civilized city.

Elections were systematically blocked, and when they took place were conducted on a system of bribery naked and unashamed. Writing to Atticus in 54 B.C. Cicero says: 'Follow me now to the Campus Martius. Canvassing is in full swing, and I will give you a token thereof. Interest was on July 15 raised

from four per cent. to eight per cent.' Political trials, like that of Gabinius, who had taken huge bribes to restore Ptolemy Auletes to the throne of Egypt, were likewise marked by gross bribery of the jury. The period, in fact, sums up in their most accentuated form all the evils for which a study of Roman social life has prepared us.



#### INTERIOR OF A RETAIL PORK-BUTCHER'S SHOP

Numerous inscriptions, wall-paintings and reliefs survive to illustrate the life of the retail shopkeeper of the second and first centuries B.C. Here is a delightfully realistic interior of a pork-butcher's shop showing the butcher chopping a joint on a block precisely similar to those in use to-day, with his wife sitting opposite making up the books. Behind the butcher is a spare chopper and his steelyard with weight and scale pan, and on a bar along the shop hang several familiar joints.

*British Museum (cast, from original in Dresden Museum)*



jumped for joy, and I thank you and congratulate you, for if in my own case Statius' fidelity and worth give me so much pleasure, of how far greater value must these same qualities be in the case of Tiro, when there are added to them literary culture and conversational power and good breeding, which are superior to those advantages I have mentioned.

The manumission of a Tiro would add a valuable citizen to Rome, but there were too many instances in which freedom manufactured wholesale by will proved no such asset; and that is why Julius Caesar was anxious to ship many freedmen overseas to his colony of Corinth.

That the presence of an enormous slave population must greatly have affected the social life of Rome is obvious. They encouraged luxury and extravagance; Cicero, in his speech against Piso, criticises the absence of a trim staff of slaves. 'Nothing of his,' he says, 'was refined or elegant: his slaves did their serving in shabby garments, some of them being even old men. The same slave acted as cook and hall-porter.' They must have displaced a good deal of free labour; they certainly rendered the policing of the city much more difficult, for they were prominent in the Clodian riots and followed in the train of turbulent spirits like Clodius and Milo in the capacity of armed bravos, quite ready to cut anyone's throat at the bidding of their master, with whom alone the responsibility for keeping them in reasonable order was supposed to rest.




**MANUMISSION OF SLAVES**  
Manumission was formally accomplished by a magistrate touching the kneeling slave with a rod. The slave wore a pointed cap of liberty ('pilleus').

From F. Cumont, 'Collection: Warocquid'

The influence, however, of the country slave who looked after the cattle on the large grazing estates of the capitalists was even worse. He was of the roughest description, and was the instrument whereby a system ruinous to Roman economics was carried on. The formidable character of such slaves when they obtained a leader is illustrated by several incidents in the history of the Republic. Sicily at the close of the second century before Christ was the scene of two serious slave risings, which extended over several years. The Carthaginian method of field

work carried out by masses of slaves was developed in this island, and these risings gave a foretaste of what was to follow in Italy under Spartacus. In the rising of 134-2 B.C. the slaves in Sicily rebelled en masse, murdered their masters, and pillaged right and left. It took three Roman armies to subdue them, and in the end twenty thousand slaves were crucified. As many of the slave herdsmen were armed, they were not unaccustomed to acts of brigandage, and indeed were sometimes expected by their masters to help themselves to the necessities of life in this way. The slave gladiators' schools at Capua supplied the initiative for a like rising in Italy. Under the leadership of Spartacus they broke out of barracks and moved into southern Italy, where an army of forty thousand was formed, and between 74 and 71 B.C. Spartacus and his army ranged over the country, capturing and sacking cities. It is small wonder that the business of travelling, towards the close of the Republic, was anything but safe.

The women, as the most important element in the life of a nation from the social standpoint, will be the final class for consideration. The sanctity of marriage is a true index of the moral condition



#### IRON STOCKS FOR IMPRISONED SLAVES

Slaves on the large estates were divided into two classes—'soluti,' unfettered, and 'vincti,' those who worked in chains. The latter when at home were confined in the 'ergastulum,' a gaol in the slaves' quarters, under the control of a gaoler. These iron stocks were found in the ergastulum on an estate near Gagnano.

From Rossetti, 'Rome,' Clarendon Press

of a state. In this the Republic exhibits a steady decline. In the early period the usual form of marriage was a very solemn ceremony of a sacramental character, known as the *confarreatum* ('*confarreatio*') from a cake of spelt ('*far*') eaten by the bride and the bridegroom. The Chief Priest of Rome (Pontifex Maximus) and the Priest of Jupiter (Flamen

Decline in marriage sanctity Dialis) were present at the ceremony, and at all times only the offspring of parents married in this way were eligible for the higher priesthoods, and the matron thus married held a position of peculiar dignity. Two other forms of lesser weight, a symbolic purchase of the wife ('*coemptio*') and a simple, uninterrupted cohabitation for a year ('*usus*'), were also valid. The important thing about these forms of marriage was that they transferred the woman and her property into the power, or into the 'hand' ('*inmanum*') as the Romans put it, of her husband.

As time went on, particularly after the Second Punic War, this transfer of a woman's property was resented by her family and by herself. Hence the preference for marriage by consent, which, though legal, did not involve the restrictions of the old ceremonies. It was a short step from this to concubinage. Betrothal, which generally took place when the parties were still of tender years, was arranged by the parents on both sides, and this affair of arrangement, rather than true love, did not augur well for the endurance of the marriage tie. A sentence from Plutarch's life of Pompey the Great, describing the political marriage of Pompey to Julius Caesar's daughter, may be taken as an example of what was constantly occurring towards the end of the Republic:

Pompey, against all expectation, married Julia the daughter of Caesar, who had been betrothed to Caepio, and was to have been married to him within a few days. As a sop to soothe Caepio's anger he agreed to let him have his own daughter, who had previously been betrothed to Faustus, the son of Sulla.

The ideal Roman matron was one who ruled the house and the female slaves

with dignified kindness, bore children and brought them up to serve the state well, and proved a true helpmeet in the home to her husband. An inscription dating from just before the Christian era records the husband's praise of a lady named Turia, and incidentally sums up the qualities of an ideal wife who suffered much for the sake of her husband in the exciting period of the Civil War. She is praised for her obedience and kindness, her assiduity in spinning—a time-honoured virtue in the Roman matron—her careful observance of religious rites, conscientious superintendence of the home, and modesty in apparel, qualities which had become rare at this epoch, but remind us of those of Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi. The epilogue is very instructive as affording an oblique comment on the tendencies of the times. 'So long a married life as ours, ended by death and not by divorce, is rare; it has been our lot to have had it prolonged for forty-one years without a quarrel.'

The criticism of the age herein implied was just. Infidelity and concubinage were rife amongst the upper classes: divorces were extraordinarily common. This tendency had begun after the Hannibalic war and increased apace. Roman women ordinarily were not sufficiently educated to prove true partners to their husbands, and men preferred the society of exceptionally brilliant women of looser morals. The average Roman aristocrat, though outwardly courteous, was a hard man, and this explains the frequency with

Great prevalence of divorces

which distinguished persons like Sulla, Pompey and Julius Caesar divorced their wives. Scandalous stories were constantly floating round Rome, and even Cicero is said to have incurred the suspicions of his unattractive wife Terentia on account of his relations with the notorious Clodia. It is hardly unfair to regard Terentia as typical of a respectable Roman matron. She was dull and inclined to be shrewish, and the latter trait was even more marked in the case of her sister-in-law Pomponia, wife of Quintus Cicero. A well known letter of Cicero gives an amusing account of the tantrums of this lady, which caused the

orator to ask her brother Atticus to let her know that she had in his judgement displayed a lack of good breeding.

If Terentia and Pomponia were types calculated to tempt their husbands to infidelity, the notorious Clodia (identified with the Lesbia of Catullus' poems) was the kind of woman to whom they had recourse for consolation and distraction. This fascinating, but utterly unprincipled, widow of Metellus Celer is perhaps somewhat hardly dealt with by Cicero on account of his deadly enmity to her brother, but there is no doubt that she dazzled and threw aside in turn some of the most brilliant of the younger Romans, such as Catullus and Caelius. Catullus has left us an unforgettable record of his captivity and disillusionment up to the:

Farewell, my lady, steeped in crime and wile;  
Henceforth thy beauty shall no heart beguile.

A very characteristic side of Roman society is illustrated by these entanglements, with their philanderings, dances—at all times sternly disapproved of by the austerer Roman—banquets, yachting parties and gay life round the shores of fashionable Baiae. This is the kind of life which afforded Ovid material for his *Lover's Art*.

While such amusements as these were indulged in by the gay and thoughtless gallants of the aristocracy on the eve of the Civil War, there was no lack of entertainment for the masses, provided by the recurring religious festivals and the public games. The best known festival is that of the Saturnalia—a winter festival held in December—which had at this epoch been extended to seven days and gave opportunities to the members of a household, both free and slave, to indulge in feasting and merrymaking.

But the most striking form of public entertainment was to be found in the great games. Of these the oldest, the Roman Games, lasted from September 5-19. They were associated with the worship of the Capitoline Jupiter, and the procession of foot, horse and chariots to the Capitol and Circus recalled a Roman triumph. Parallel to the Roman were the Plebeian Games, held from November 1-17, and dating, like so many public festivals, from the time of the Second Punic War. These games showed a constant tendency to increase in number and length, and were a great drain upon the resources of the state and the pockets of individuals; and there is no doubt that they were responsible for much of



SOLEMNISATION OF MATRIMONY IN ROME

Joining hands was the essential part of the Roman marriage ceremony. In this relief from a sarcophagus a husband and wife are shown with right hands thus clasped; the 'pronuba'—the bride's matron friend—stands between them with a hand on the shoulder of each, and immediately behind the bride is a man, perhaps her father. Right and left of the group are mythological personages—Valour, Victory and Good Fortune—whose attendance is a happy augury to a newly married pair.

British Museum



GROTESQUE MOSAIC FROM POMPEII

Pompeians had a passion for colour, and covered the walls of their houses with painted panels and the floors with mosaics. This grotesque comic study of a mendicant musician was one of the mosaics in the villa of Cicero. The colour of the original is pleasing and the drawing vigorous and free.

*National Museum, Naples; photo, Altieri*

the enormous debts incurred by prominent persons towards the close of the Republic. Caesar, as aedile, is said 'to have furnished 320 pairs of gladiators, and to have surpassed all efforts of his predecessors in his expenditure on theatres, processions and banquets.' Caelius, already mentioned in connexion with Clodia, was continually begging Cicero, as governor of Cilicia, to help him by sending panthers for his shows, a request which illustrates yet another class of exactions imposed upon provincials.

More detailed accounts of chariot racing, gladiatorial combats, wild beast baiting and theatrical representations may conveniently be reserved for the description, in Chapter 71, of life in Imperial Rome. It should, however, be pointed out that these forms of entertainment had attained great vogue, if not always great popularity, at the close of the Republic. Nor would it be right to omit reference to a letter of Cicero written on the occasion of the opening of Pompey's permanent stone theatre, the first of its kind, in 55 B.C. Writing to his friend Marius, he says:

Why should I think you miss the athletes, seeing that you have expressed a contempt for gladiators; and, indeed, in their case, Pompey himself admits that he has wasted his labour and midnight oil. In addition,

there are the wild beast hunts, two on each of five days, magnificent, no one denies it; but what delight can a man of culture find when a weak man is mangled by a very strong beast, or a splendid beast is transfixed by a hunting-spear? The last day was devoted to elephants; at this there was great bewonderment on the part of the vulgar, but no real pleasure—indeed, a kind of pity ensued, and a feeling that this animal has something in common with the human race.

This is an interesting verdict passed by the most cultured man of his day on a class of exhibition that was to attain enormous popularity under the Empire.

In the great games chariot racing in the Circus Maximus was the principal feature, but

under the Republic there were only two colours, the red and the white, and there were no emperors to fan the popular excitement by favouring a particular colour. Frantic scenes of backing were probably not yet in evidence. Gladiatorial shows were given by magistrates or seekers of magisterial office either in the Forum or the Circus, and also at funeral games. Cicero, writing to Curio in 53 B.C.,



A DEALER IN SPELLS

This mosaic illustrates a scene from a comedy—a young woman's visit to a witch who deals in love potions. The crone holds up a silver cup, and on the table are a thurible and a box of charms.

*National Museum, Naples; photo, Altieri*

tells him to rely on personal qualities rather than on funeral games, for by this time everyone is sick and tired of them.

In the theatre stage-plays formed part of the games, but creative power was lacking, and there was a tendency to revive the plays of the preceding century. Probably scenes such as those described by Terence repeated themselves at this period :

When first I put the play upon the stage  
Boxers and tight-rope walkers were the rage.  
The claque, the uproar and the women's cries  
Caused me to beat retreat in hurried wise.  
Again I show the play: the first act wins  
Applause, and then a rumour just begins  
Of gladiators—how the people race  
And push each other for a front-view place.

Cicero, in the same letter in which he recorded his opinion of wild beast baiting, also gave his view of the acting. 'In the first place those had as an honour returned to the stage who had, as I thought, retired to save their honour; as for your favourite Aesopus, his acting was such as to make all anxious for him to quit the stage.' Only topical allusions seem to have aroused enthusiasm, as when an actor interpolated this line against Pompey :

'Tis to our misery that thou art Great.

The truth is, that despite the efforts of a great actor like Roscius, who tried to revive Plautine comedy, the Romans were of too coarse a fibre really to enjoy the drama, and it is significant that elaborate effects had to be introduced as likely to attract audiences. Farces and mimes were far more popular, with their burlesques of everyday manners, as were also the so-called pantomimes, which were really mimicry of gestures without speech.

It remains to determine what general tendencies can be established from this study of Roman social life. The austerity and devotion to duty of the Roman people before the Hannibalic war commands respect, but does not excite enthusiasm, because it was lacking in brilliance and intellectual culture. Cato the Censor is a survivor of this age, except in so far as even he was not quite untouched by the prevailing Greek influence of his time. He was punctilious in carrying out what

he conceived to be his duty towards his family and the state, but he was withal a hard man to his slaves and to his women-folk, and was one who sought rather to preserve old customs with rigidity than to guide the new culture into channels profitable to the individual and the community alike.

The progress of Roman society from the time of the Second Punic War to the Civil War affords valuable warnings to modern civilization. It reveals the dangers which accompany the decay of agriculture and the growth of a large and idle city population, barely kept in check by bribery, doles and shows, while a solid middle class is wanting. It demonstrates the demoralising effect of large masses of slaves, the perils of culture unaccompanied by moral discipline, and of wealth when its possessors are without a sense of responsibility and seek only their own pleasure. It shows the social disasters which follow in the train of an ill-educated and frivolous womanhood and the disregard of the marriage tie, the pitfalls which await power when it is looked upon mainly as an opportunity for plunder, the ill-faring of a land where religion is regarded as a sham or as a mere means of gratifying excitement.

Mommsen passed a severe judgement upon the Rome of this period in the following words: 'If we try to conceive to ourselves a London with the slave-population of New Orleans, with the police of Constantinople, with the non-industrial character of modern Rome, and agitated by politics after the fashion of the Paris of 1848, we shall acquire an approximate idea of the Republican glory, the departure of which Cicero and his associates in their sulky letters deplore.' This judgement is in the main just, but it would be wrong to forget that in a previous age the Republic had established a high standard of law-abidingness and self-sacrifice. The evils of a society are always more easily recognized than its virtues, and a community could not have been utterly rotten which, thanks to the valiant efforts of Julius Caesar and his grand-nephew Augustus, survived to enjoy the golden age of Trajan, Hadrian and Antoninus Pius.

## FROM THE GRACCHI TO AUGUSTUS

A Study of Twelve Great Romans who  
lived in the Last Century of the Republic

By F. A. WRIGHT

Professor of Classics in the University of London

OF the men who made the early State of Rome, from its mythical foundation by Romulus in 753 B.C. down to the capture of the city by the Gauls in 390, we know very little. The next period, from 390 to 146, when the Romans were conquering Italy and the Mediterranean world, was one of great achievements, but not of great men. When we come to the last century of the Republic a succession of great characters suddenly appears, characters who impress themselves so vividly on the records of history that even now they are not forgotten.

It is convenient to take the lives of the brothers Gracchi together, for though in many respects they were men of dissimilar character, they both possessed one predominant quality, inherited perhaps through their mother Cornelia from their grandfather the great Scipio Africanus, the quality of 'temeritas,' an impatience of the conventions so dear to the Roman mind and a boldness of action that often drew near to the vice of rashness. A cautious hesitation, a sympathy with tradition, a respect for ancestral usage, were among the strongest characteristics of the average Roman. Innovations, even if at first sight beneficial, seemed in the long run dangerous; and it was a reckless disregard of this ingrained belief that brought the Gracchi to their lamentable end. As their own respectable relative Scipio Aemilianus said: 'So may all perish who dare to venture on new ways.'

There is an anecdote that Cornelia one day received a visit from a woman friend who desired to see her jewels. 'These are my jewels,' she said, as she drew aside a curtain and pointed to the sleeping forms of her two young sons. Tiberius (163-133 B.C.), especially, when he grew to manhood,

was a son of whom any mother, a husband of whom any wife, might be proud. Brave, handsome and eloquent, he was filled with an unselfish desire to benefit his fellow men and to bring back to Rome the good old days, as he conceived them, when every man had his own piece of land, his fireside and his home. 'The wild beasts of Italy,' he cried in one of his speeches, 'have holes and dens wherein to shelter: the heroes who shed their blood for our country have nothing left them but light and air.' As tribune accordingly he brought in a bill whereby the state was to resume possession of all the land in Italy, to leave the existing owners five hundred acres each, and to divide the rest into allotments of thirty acres at a small rent.

Whether such a project was feasible is doubtful; and whether the new allotment holders could have competed successfully with the foreign corn that was already pouring into Rome is more doubtful still. But to the impetuous zeal of Tiberius any opposition seemed malignant treason, and when his fellow tribune Octavius vetoed his proposals he persuaded the people illegally to depose his colleague, and then asked to be elected for a second year of office. The city at once was thrown into a turmoil. Tiberius surrounded himself with a bodyguard of friends, and on the day of election declared himself in danger of assassination. His followers charged their opponents; a party of senators under Scipio Nasica joined in the fray; and as Tiberius, struggling amidst the crowd, stumbled and fell over a corpse, his brains were beaten out with a footstool.

At the time of his brother's death Gaius Gracchus (153-121 B.C.) was a youth of



twenty. But he had already been appointed one of the three Land Commissioners, and as soon as he was able he resumed Tiberius' work. Gaius, however, was not a sentimental enthusiast; he was a practical politician, and his guiding motive was vehement ambition rather than generous benevolence. He saw in himself another Pericles, and hoped by the perpetual possession of the tribunate to override the Senate's authority and occupy at Rome the same position that his great exemplar had held in Athens.

He waited for ten years, and then began to propose and press through the Popular Assembly a series of laws, which were

meant to absorb into his hands the entire administration of the Roman Empire.

The first, and the most disastrous in its ultimate results, was his Corn Law, whereby corn was sold to the urban voters at just half its real value. His next, a necessary corollary, was intended to render agriculture possible for Italian farmers by establishing for them overseas colonies, where they would not be ruined by the unnatural conditions of the Roman market.

Having thus won the support of the city mob and the rural voters, Gaius devised another weapon for himself in the new equestrian order of capitalists, to whom he handed over the control of the law-courts and the privilege of farming the taxes of Asia Minor; and by the end of his second year of office the more timorous senators began to suspect in him an uncrowned tyrant. But Gaius, unfortunately for himself, lacked the armed force which is a tyrant's real strength. The Roman mob were his friends as long as he consulted only their interests; when he proposed to extend the franchise to the Italians they at once grew lukewarm.

The Senate took advantage of this change of feeling, and with the help of another tribune, one Marcus Drusus, so dexterously undermined Gaius' position that when the time came for him to be elected tribune for a third year, he found himself rejected. His enemies now had their opportunity, and began by proposing the repeal of his colonial laws. The day for voting arrived, and those

ardent democrats who still remained loyal to the fallen leader came down to the Forum armed with knives and clubs. The bloodshed they anticipated took place, and again a Gracchus was the victim of senatorial fury and popular ingratitude. Gaius, who had sprained his ankle, endeavoured to escape from his assailants. But though he called repeatedly for a horse, no one came to his help. 'For this treachery,' he cried, 'may the Roman people never cease to be slaves,' and ordered the one Greek servant who remained with him to stab him to the heart.

Those to whom names have a mystical significance may find it interesting to observe that the four great Roman democratic statesmen all bore the same praenomen. Gaius Flaminius gave the unprivileged classes land, Gaius Gracchus gave them food, Gaius Marius gave them pay, and Gaius Caesar gave them everything. All four were innovators, and Marius not the least among them.

Gaius Marius (155-86 B.C.) was endowed to a supreme degree with the Roman virtue of 'fortitudo'; not the quality that we call bravery, but rather the stubborn endurance that brought the Romans through all their wars, in spite of initial failures, to a successful end, and brought Marius first from the ranks to supreme command, and later in his life from the marshes of Minturnae to his seventh consulship. Born of humble parents, full-bodied, red-faced and fierce-eyed, he possessed neither culture, eloquence nor political sagacity. But he was the first great soldier to spring from the people, and that was sufficient to gain him office. As consul he concluded the Jugurthine War and then was recalled home in haste to face the formidable menace of a German invasion. Serious dangers call for strong remedies, and Marius met the situation by a drastic army reform.

Until his time military service, both in Greece and Rome, had been, not a trade, but a privilege and duty confined to citizens. If paid soldiers were wanted they were hired from abroad, and the same word in Greek means both 'mercenary' and 'foreigner.' Citizens received their

bare expenses, but except for an uncertain share of the spoil they were no richer at the end of a war than they had been at the beginning. The system was possible as long as campaigns were of short duration and fought in a man's own country. But the Hannibalic War in Italy and the overseas wars with Macedonia and Syria that followed immediately after put too great a strain upon it at Rome, and by the middle of the second century B.C. it was plain that it had broken down. To substitute another method, a method that lasted for nearly twenty centuries, until the modern days of conscription, was Marius' great work.

When Marius returned from Africa he had two urgent duties; first to raise and then to train a new army. Instead of issuing the usual levy notices to the propertied classes he called on all free men to volunteer, promised them a grant of land sufficient for maintenance at the end of their service, and swept away all grades and distinctions in the army itself. Then

he gave his troops a long period of such intense training that they were known as 'Marius' mules', marching with them on foot, sharing their food, and putting hand himself to spade and trenching tool. The immediate result was the destruction of the German hordes at Aquae Sextiae; a secondary, the creation of an army attached by ties of loyalty and self-interest to one man. So within half a century the armed democracy gave birth to the military empire.

Fifty years of Marius' life were spent in constant effort, which was, however, crowned by success. He saved Rome from the greatest danger she had yet known; he reorganized the army; he was six times consul. But in Sulla he met a man greater even than himself, and if it had not been for his invincible stubbornness, he would have acknowledged his inferiority. When the younger general with his legions marched on Rome, 88 B.C., Marius was compelled to flee the city and a price was set upon his head.

He found a ship to take him to Africa, but the captain, on reflection, thought him too dangerous a passenger, and he was put on shore again. For days he hid

in a ditch covered with reeds, until his retreat was detected and he was dragged off to prison. The local magistrates decided to put him to death; but when the executioner saw the old man's fierce eyes, he flung down his sword and cried: 'I cannot kill Marius.' Accordingly he was sent off to Africa, and there sat as an exile amid the ruins of Carthage. The unexpected triumph of the democrats in 87 allowed him to return; a seventh consulship fulfilled the prophecy which had sustained his resolution, but he died a fortnight after his election, while the blood of his enemies was reddening the streets of Rome.

Of all the statesmen that the Roman Republic produced Lucius Cornelius Sulla (138-78 B.C.) offers the greatest interest to the 'Folioles': Lucius psychologist. He is the Cornelius Sulla strangest compound of

selfishness and unselfishness, of courtesy and cruelty, of the lowest vices of a Greek tyrant and the highest virtues of a Roman patriot. Entirely devoid of any personal ambition, he yet held supreme power for two years, only to lay down that power of his own free will when he judged that his political work was finished. Urbane in his dealings with men and irresistible with women of every class, he was yet the author of the most sanguinary of proscriptions and looked on with indifference while thousands of innocent victims were murdered in cold blood. In public affairs he upheld with unflinching vigour the ancient ideals of an aristocratic government superior to any corruption, yet in private he surrendered, grossly and voluptuously, to the new pleasures that Greece was teaching her conquerors, and lived surrounded by courtesans, catamites and cooks.

The excesses of his old age were perhaps partly due to the privations of his youth; for, favourite of fortune though he was, Sulla in his early days knew by bitter experience the difficulties that beset the path of an impoverished aristocrat. His first stroke of luck was when a woman of the town left him the fortune she had accumulated in the practice of her profession. The second came when, acting as

quaestor under Marius in Africa, he secured by guile what his commanding officer had missed by force of arms, and brought Jugurtha in chains to Rome.

After that the road lay open. A governorship in Cilicia was followed by a series of victories in the Social War, and these in turn by the consulship, 88 B.C., and the command against Mithradates. His struggles with Marius and the democrats who attempted to deprive him of that command, his triumphs in the East and his final settlement with Cinna and his domestic foes in 83, need only here be barely mentioned. The battle of the Colline Gate, that crowning mercy, left him undisputed master in Italy, and he was free at last to undertake a thorough purging of the state.

His guiding idea was quite simple. Himself a convinced oligarch, he thought that a strong oligarchy was the best government that a country could have. He therefore proceeded to strengthen the Senate in all possible ways, and to weaken every section in the state that might oppose the Senate's authority. All laws had now to have the Senate's sanction before they could be introduced to the people. Thus the popular assembly was rendered impotent. If a man was once elected tribune he was not eligible for any other magistracy, nor, indeed, for the tribunate again until ten years had passed; therefore no man of ability was likely to stand. Other enactments brought the executive much more under the Senate's control than it had been before, and the privileges of the equestrian order were ruthlessly curtailed.

These reforms, skilfully devised as they were, depended ultimately for their successful working on a certain level of senatorial ability. That ability was not available, and, a few years after his death, Sulla's new constitution was swept away. But there was another set of Cornelian laws, doubtless regarded as far less important by their author, which were never repealed, and still exercise an influence on our society. By the institution of standing courts to try each various kind of offence Sulla became the founder of Roman criminal law, and, incidentally,

of all those modern legal systems that derive therefrom. As Marius created the professional soldier, so Sulla created the professional lawyer.

His work completed, Sulla married a young wife, a damsel who had first attracted his attention at the theatre by picking off a fringe from his toga that she might share in his good luck; and then he laid down the dictatorship and retired with his lady to his country house on the south coast. There he spent the final year of his life, enjoying the pleasures he loved most. His last recorded act was to send for a corrupt official who had boasted that he would escape punishment, and have him strangled at his bedside. His self-composed epitaph sums up his career:

No friend ever did me such service, nor enemy such mischief, that I did not pay him back in overflowing measure.

One of the most obvious defects in the Roman character was the quality which in Latin is called

'avaritia'; not at all 'Avaritia': Marcus our sordid avarice, but Licinius Crassus the more dangerous

habit of thinking that money is all-powerful and all-important. If people think very strongly that a thing is so it becomes so for them, and among the Romans in the last century of the Republic the supreme omnipotent divinity was Gold. All classes worshipped at the shrine and Crassus was the high priest.

From the very beginning of his career Marcus Licinius Crassus (107-53 B.C.) displayed an inordinate love of money-making. Under Sulla he proved himself a skilful and fortunate general; but he completely forfeited the Dictator's confidence by embezzling the enemies' military chest and by seizing the property of men whose names had never appeared on Sulla's proscription lists. Dismissed into private life, he turned all his energies into one channel, and within a few years made himself by far the richest man in Rome. His inherited property was comparatively modest, but he had the genius of acquisition and knew exactly how to invest his money to the best advantage.

Land and houses were the solid foundation of his fortune, the first acquired by

buying cheaply from the state the property of proscribed democrats, the second gained by an even more subtle and economical method. Fires were common in Rome, and there was no fire brigade until Crassus organized a large private gang of his own men. Whenever there was a big blaze he would arrive on the scene and offer to buy the adjoining houses—at his price. If the owners consented, and they were usually willing to cut their loss, the fire was put out and the houses saved; if not, they were allowed to burn. It must, of course, be acknowledged that Crassus, like most successful money getters, had no sense of shame. He was the most notorious of money-lenders; he personally trained the slaves whom he let out as cooks, and his constant interviews with a Vestal Virgin, whose property he was trying to buy under cost, once almost brought him into the unpleasant predicament of being charged with incest.

Still, as the Roman proverb has it, 'money does not smell,' and however unsavoury the means he

**Money buys the Triumvirate** employed Crassus was indisputably a great force and could bargain on equal terms with Pompey and Caesar when they agreed in 61 to combine their resources. The first five years of the Triumvirate offered small scope to his peculiar abilities; but there can be little doubt that in that period Pompey's returned veterans were beginning to spread through Rome rumours of the huge treasures buried in Asia and waiting to be found. In any case, when the three confederates divided up the world atresch in 55 B.C., Crassus insisted on receiving the Eastern command, and taking an army went off to seize the Persian gold.

The Parthians, however, proved a fatal obstacle. The old Roman—he was over sixty and looked older than his years—was caught by their archers in the sandy desert of Carrhae, his army annihilated and himself killed. According to one story, as he lay dead, molten gold was poured down his throat so that at last his insatiable thirst for money might be quenched. According to another, his head was cut off and sent by special messenger to the Parthian king's court, where

a troupe of strolling Greek actors performing Euripides' *Bacchae* used it in place of the property head of Pentheus.

In Pompey (106–48 B.C.) we have the perfect Whig, the ideal hero of Macaulay's dreams, a type so essentially Scottish that it is not surprising if he alone 'Continents': Gnaeus of the Romans is Pompeius Magnus commonly known

among us as The Great. The title was given him, perhaps half in mockery, by the Tory Sulla; but in Pompey Whiggery reaches such heroic proportions that it cannot be said to be undeserved. A total lack of humour, an intense respectability, a sincere but narrow patriotism, great powers of administration balanced by a painful weakness of imagination, a craving, carefully concealed, for power, and a fixed resolve to keep others out if one cannot get in oneself—these are some of the chief Whig qualities, and these were the chief features in Pompey's character.

The son of a parvenu of doubtful reputation, Pompey (Gnaeus Pompeius) gained fame and position by his own solid merits. He proved himself the most capable of Sulla's subordinates, was chosen by him to root out the democrats in Africa and Sicily, and while still a young man holding no official position received from the Dictator the unexampled honour of a triumph. The crushing of Lepidus' conspiracy in 77 was followed by five years' arduous fighting against Sertorius in Spain and by a return to Italy in time to stamp out the embers of the Slave War.

At the head of a veteran army Pompey was then in much the same position as Marius had been before him and Caesar was to be later. But after a year's uneasy coalition with Crassus, in which the ill-matched associates repealed most of Sulla's laws, he retired into private life, and only emerged from it with apparent reluctance in 67 to carry out a short and brilliant campaign against the pirates. The Gabinian Law gave him powers that were altogether unconstitutional, but he had a salve for his uneasy conscience in the fact that he had not solicited either them or the even more irregular command against Mithradates which the tribune Manilius thrust upon him in 66.

His term of office in the East was the great period of Pompey's life, and his organization of Syria was as important to the welfare of the Empire as was Caesar's organization of Gaul. The Senate, however, was incapable of recognizing service; and on his return in 62 Pompey was compelled, almost against his will, to join forces with Crassus and Caesar. The next ten years showed in Rome, as the years after Waterloo showed in England, that a man may be the best of generals yet the most incompetent of politicians.

Caesar gradually drew away from Pompey, the Senate gradually drew towards him; and when at last in 50 the die was cast for war there was no doubt on which side he would stand. On three occasions in his own career he had found himself at the head of a devoted army, faced by the perverse opposition of the Senate, and tempted to make himself master of the state by force. He had resisted the temptation—whether from prudence or coldness of temperament or genuine patriotism is immaterial—and it was not likely that he would allow a rival to seize the power which he himself had refused.

The contest that followed was one between quick audacity and prudent slowness. Pompey made his first mistake in leaving Italy, his second in giving battle against his own judgement at Pharsalus. After that crushing defeat he fled to Egypt, and there found how great is the difference in the East between success and failure. As he stepped on shore from his galley he was stabbed in the back, and his head was cut off and taken to Caesar.

It was a favourite maxim with the wise men of antiquity that states would never be rightly governed until a king became a philosopher or a philosopher became a king. On the few occasions, however, when the maxim was put into practice the results were not encouraging. The Greek philosopher Demetrius when he became master of Athens proved a particularly licentious tyrant. The Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius, in spite of his philosophical abilities, found himself faced by disaster in most of his undertakings. And even more signally did the wise and

upright Marcus Porcius Cato (95-46 B.C.) lead to ruin the senatorial party of which he was the head.

As a matter of fact Cato's outlook on life was vitiated by one cardinal error. He insisted on looking behind, to the past, while it is the statesman's first duty to look forward, to the future. Unfortunately he was descended from that arch-reactionary Cato the Censor, and being full of the spirit of ancestor worship he resolved to model his conduct in all circumstances upon that of his illustrious progenitor. But although he possessed most of the Censor's virtues, his sincerity, his financial rectitude, his industry and his love of truth, he lacked

those vices which made Undue reverence  
the elder Cato formidable: for the Past  
he was neither selfish,

surly, overbearing nor cruel. For example, when his friend Hortensius came to him and asked him to divorce his wife Marcia in order that he, Hortensius, might marry her, Cato reluctantly, in the name of friendship, consented. He was living happily with Marcia, and after the death of Hortensius took her back and lived happily with her to the end; but he conceived that it was a good man's duty to be unselfish and oblige a friend.

To the common judgement there seems something absurd and almost offensive in generosity like this; but Cato never feared either ridicule or dislike. He was a strict puritan in matters of sex, and strongly disapproved of the Floralia, where by custom the women dancers divested themselves of their usual light attire and appeared naked on the stage. Accordingly Cato attended the show one day, and as soon as the first naked woman showed herself, got up from his seat and walked solemnly out of the theatre. The people jeered at him angrily, but Cato had made his protest and was satisfied.

Protests such as these were Cato's chief weapons in combating both the political and the social evils of his day; and although they were usually just, they were painfully ineffective. He protested in 63 against Caesar's complicity in Catiline's plot; he protested in 62 against what he considered to be Pompey's extortionate demands; he protested in 61

against the tax farmers of Asia being excused from their contract; he protested in 60 against the union of Caesar, Pompey and Crassus, and still more violently against the measures which they proposed. That he was making all these men his enemies and forcing them into hostility towards the Senate did not concern him; he was doing his duty as he conceived it.

It is easy to make a good man look ridiculous, and Cato offers an obvious handle to the cynical humourist. But it should be remembered that he was not only a good, he was also a great man; an expert financier, a skilful administrator and a general who won and kept the devoted loyalty of his soldiers. It was he who rendered inevitable the final and necessary struggle between Caesar and the Senate, and in all the fighting in Greece and Africa he played an heroic part. When it became certain after Thapsus that all was lost he took the only logical course, and by suicide rejoined the great souls of antiquity who had been his guides and patterns through life.

If one wishes to realize what manner of man Gaius Julius Caesar (102-44 B.C.) really was, it is only

'Magnanimitas': Gaius necessary to look  
Julius Caesar carefully at the  
portrait bust that

is now in the Museum at Naples (see page 1780). The face proclaims the mind, and that broad brow, firm mouth and keen eyes reveal the qualities that make Caesar one of the greatest men in our world's history. Compare him with the Apsley portrait of Cicero (page 1779), and you will see the difference between the man of deeds and the man of words. Compare him with the Ny Carlsberg bust of Pompey (page 1775), and you will see the difference between the man who thought for himself and the man who depended ultimately upon the opinion of others.

No one stands really upon the same level as Caesar save Alexander and Napoleon; and even these two in universality of genius are his inferiors. Caesar was both a great demagogue and a great statesman, both a great general and a great author, both a great lover of women and a great master of men. Moreover, while Alexander and Napoleon reached the

height of their achievement in early manhood, Caesar's powers were continually growing and in his fifty-eighth year he crowded into twelve months the work of an ordinary ruler's lifetime.

With a man so versatile as this, it is perhaps misleading to lay stress on particular qualities. But it may be safely said that rapidity and resolution were the keynotes of his character. One incident in his early life is typical of his whole career. While he was travelling in the East and waiting for the Sullan regime to end, he was taken prisoner by pirates; but by sheer force of personality he compelled his captors to treat him as an honoured guest. When his ransom, which he insisted should be a large one, arrived, he made his way to the nearest port, hired a few galleys, returned, crucified the entire gang, and got his money back. The same cynical humour is shown in his remark to the braggart who was displaying the scars on his chest: 'Numquam fugiens respexeris'—'You should never look round when you are running away.' It was this combination of coolness and intrepidity that made him first the idol of the Roman mob, then the successful general in Spain, then the conqueror of Gaul, and finally the master of the world.

It is unnecessary here to describe the process whereby the ringleted young demagogue of 72 B.C. became the bald old dictator of 45 B.C. By that year Caesar had chased the armed forces of the oligarchs round the Mediterranean and had exterminated them even

more thoroughly than Sulla had exterminated

the democrats. Then came the double problem of finance and form of government. A long period of civil war had emptied the treasury and all the power in the state had fallen into one man's hands. The old convention under which the people ruled in theory and the Senate in practice was obsolete, and it remained for Caesar to find a new method.

It would seem that he determined to solve both questions together by an Eastern campaign. The gold of Persia would fill up the empty coffers of Rome, and, once recognized by the East as a semi-divine autocrat, it would be possible

From demagogue  
to dictator

to inculcate the same belief upon the Western world. A few centuries later the monarchy by right divine became an established fact; but even Caesar did not realize how the Romans clung to the past. His own friends murmured the word 'tyranny,' and when Brutus and Cassius saw that the Parthian expedition was imminent, they decided that it must be prevented at all costs. So came the Ides of March and Caesar's death.

There are many different kinds of greatness. It is possible for a great man

to be vain and ir-  
'Eloquentia': Marous resolute, to be lack-  
Tullius Cicero ing in both prudence  
and insight; to be

inexact in his statements and a poor judge of character. Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 B.C.) had all these defects; and yet his title to greatness cannot be denied. To-day we recognize that politics, in spite of a certain connexion with the practice of the law, is in reality a profession by itself. A famous general, a famous administrator, a famous author with us usually sticks to his own last; and shows his wisdom by so doing. In Rome the condition of the body politic was such that every man of eminence was drawn to try his hand at curing its maladies. Cicero, like Marius and Pompey, left his own proper sphere and endeavoured with very little success to play the statesman. Hence the severity of the criticisms that have been passed upon his character. But his failure as a politician should not blind us to his genius in other directions.

His political career, which seemed to him to be enormously important, may be briefly dismissed. A new man from the country, his eloquence was his only weapon in the struggle for office. But eloquence at Rome was a great asset, and it carried Cicero quickly through the subordinate grades to the consulship in 63. In that year occurred one of the many attempts to upset the existing constitution; and Cicero acted with commendable resolution in suppressing Catiline.

He was indeed too resolute, for instead of being honoured for ever, as he expected, as the saviour of the country, he was exiled soon afterwards on the charge of having put Roman citizens to

death without trial. In a little time he was allowed to return; but his self-esteem had suffered a cruel blow and he remained a waverer in politics till Caesar's assassination. Though he had not been admitted to any knowledge of that plot, when the deed was done he gave it his fervent blessing, and came out from his retirement to oppose Antony. But once again he was unsuccessful. The Senate was impotent, and the rival army leaders could afford to disregard the old orator. When the proscription lists of 37 were issued he was certainly among the victims; but it was probably his wealth quite as much as his political influence that was the cause of his death.

Cicero would have made an admirable president of a debating society; but as he could not control his own wife it was scarcely surprising that he could not control the Roman people. The greatness of his literary work, however, more than compensates for his weakness in action. He did not realize it himself, but he was always more at his ease in his study than in the Senate, and he is far the most lovable of all the Romans: kind, witty and humane, an affectionate father and a generous, loyal friend. Greece was his spiritual home rather than Italy, and both in his speeches and his letters he constantly betrays himself. To most of his countrymen brevity seemed the soul of wit; Cicero, like a Greek, loved words for themselves, and is never satisfied until he has said the same thing two or three times over. Definiteness is the one thing a Roman valued, the one thing that Cicero avoids; he makes almost as many provisos as Demosthenes; if he means to refuse a request he does not say 'No,' but rather, 'Yes—unless I am prevented'; and instead of 'it is,' he much prefers 'it would appear to be.'

But these idiosyncrasies do not affect the splendid flow of his eloquence when he is at his best, and in such passages as the conclusion of the Second Philippic he reaches the highest summits of oratory. Equally important is his work in popularising Greek philosophy and rhetoric, while his general influence on European literature has perhaps been greater than

that of any other one man. He is the supreme artist in words, and far more truly than Nero might he have said of himself, when the assassin's knife was at his throat: '*Qualis artifex pereo*'—'What art dies with me!'

The Romans as a people were curiously unlike the Greeks and curiously like the English. They were practical, stubborn and unromantic; too much inclined to the pleasures of the flesh and too little attracted by the chaster delights of intellectual speculation. But the chief

English virtue, the virtue of cheerful audacity, they never possessed. Not commonly possessing it, they

thought '*audacia*' a vice rather than a virtue, and were thankful for their freedom from temptation. And in the career of Marcus Antonius (anglicised as Mark Antony—he and Pompey are almost the only Romans whose names are more familiar to us in their English than in their Latin shape) his countrymen must often have found an opportunity to point their favourite moral: '*Safety first.*'

Mark Antony (83–30 B.C.) was one of Caesar's men, the last of that company of brilliant adventurers to which Clodius, Mamurra, Caelius and Curio had belonged. Of all the band he enjoyed the Dictator's closest confidence, and on the day after the Ides of March he stepped, as far as his abilities allowed, into his dead chief's place. Cicero and the miserable remnant of the senatorial party whom the old orator tried to galvanise into life offered him no great difficulty. But the combination of Octavian's subtlety with Agrippa's vigour was another matter. It is curious to notice how contempt on Antony's part changed first to toleration and then to respect, and finally to a sort of fear, the fear that a lion might feel of a serpent. The whole process only lasted four years and, in spite of his advantage in age, in strength and in military prestige, Antony was so completely out-jockeyed by his rival that he was glad in 40 B.C. to make with him the Treaty of Brundisium, to accept his sister Octavia as wife in place of the termagant Fulvia who had just died, and to retire from Italy to take up the command in the East.

But before Antony began his Parthian wars, he met his fate in Cleopatra. He had summoned the queen to him as a culprit, to give account of the help she had rendered to Cassius. The Egyptian, however, who knew by past experience of Caesar and Sextus Pompeius the susceptibility of Roman hearts, smiled at his threats. As Plutarch tells us, she sailed to him up the river Cydnus in a barge with gilded poop, its sails spread purple, its rowers urging it on with silver oars to the sound of the flute blended with pipes and lutes. She herself, adorned like Venus, reclined beneath a canopy spangled with gold, while boy Cupids fanned her on either side, and the fairest of her maidens, attired as sea nymphs, stood ready at the ropes. A rumour spread that Venus had come to revel with Bacchus for the good of Asia; and Antony, burly and sanguine, who had already made his entry into Ephesus escorted by the wine god's cortège of maenads and satyrs, was quite ready to play his part.

Serious historians have wondered why great men like Caesar and Antony should have wasted their time and strength in what they call '*amorous dalliance.*' But they probably have not realized that to a truly bold spirit the conquest of such a woman as Cleopatra, a conquest that must every day be renewed and can never be regarded as complete, is a difficult and dangerous task that offers irresistible attractions. A price, of course, has to be paid, and at Actium Antony paid the price for his nine years with Cleopatra. But whether Augustus or Antony got the more enjoyment from life and whether Livia or Cleopatra was the more entertaining companion are questions that cannot be answered without some consideration.

A man's fame and the figure that he cuts in history do not always depend upon his own merits.

Fortune and the '*Industria*': Marcus chances of literature Vipsanius Agrippa play no insignificant

part. The lives of the other great men with whom these pages have been concerned are narrated at length by Plutarch and Suetonius. Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa alone has no formal biographer and is consequently far less known and far



less esteemed than he deserves. Yet of all the twelve he is perhaps the best example of his countrymen's typical virtues; and if we consider the actual achievements of his industry we shall find that only Caesar can equal Agrippa's record.

There is furthermore a particular reason why Agrippa's name should be more familiar than it is to English readers. He was the first Roman to show any conception of the importance of sea power, the first to establish a permanent fleet with definite duties in peace time as well as in war. Before his reforms navies were built hastily for some special emergency, and when that emergency was over ceased to function; their crews were disbanded and the ships themselves allowed to rot. The consequence was that piracy, officially destroyed by Pompey in 67 B.C., was as flourishing as ever in 37 B.C., and Sextus Pompeius at the head of the corsair fleets was a serious danger to the Triumvirate.

It would take too long to describe here how Agrippa constructed his great harbour by joining the Lucrine and Avernian lakes, how he spent laborious months training his sailors as Marius before him had trained his legionaries, and how as a result at the battles of Mylae and Naulochus piracy was swept off the sea, not to lift its head again for several centuries. Equally important was the victory at Actium, 31 B.C., for which Agrippa was solely responsible; and even if his life work had ended with his organization of the fleet Agrippa would be one of the great figures in Roman history.

But naval affairs were only one section of Agrippa's activities. In 33 B.C. he accepted

the aedileship and began  
**Public works** those public works at Rome  
**of Agrippa** of which many remain to-day  
 as his permanent memorials.

Turning from salt water to fresh, he constructed a new aqueduct, the Julia, some of whose arches can still be seen in the Aurelian Wall; then, after organizing a gang of public slaves to manage the water service, he built for the people's use the first of those huge bathing establishments which became in later times the most wonderful features of the city. For the people's benefit also were the arcades in the Campus Martius, which he had named after himself and his sister Polla,

elaborate structures decorated with frescoes and offering to loungers a welcome refuge from the sun. These have now disappeared; but his Pantheon, built probably to commemorate Actium, though radically altered under the Empire is the best preserved of all ancient structures in Rome.

These achievements of civil administration were but interludes in a long series of provincial governorships in all parts of the Roman world which involved many difficult military campaigns. After bringing the Perusine War in

Italy to an end (40 B.C.),  
**Agrippa's wars and governorships**  
 Agrippa spent the years 38 and 37 in Gaul and

Germany, subduing a serious revolt among the still scarcely pacified frontier tribes. Then for some time he was busy with the fleet, and after Actium there were many problems of government at Rome to occupy his attention. In 19 B.C. he took command in Spain, and two years later went to Syria, only leaving it to quell a dangerous rebellion in Pannonia. And in addition to all this he was an author and something of a scientist. He wrote memoirs of his own time as well as a treatise on geography, and in his sister Polla's arcade there was exhibited a map in marble which he himself had constructed after he had carried out that survey of the whole world to which S. Luke refers.

Even now we have not mentioned the most arduous of all Agrippa's tasks, a task in which a man like Tiberius miserably failed. Happily wedded to Pomponia, the daughter of Cicero's friend, Atticus, he divorced his wife in order to marry into the President's family and so establish the succession. His first essay, with a niece Marcella, proved unsuccessful; and then in 21 B.C. he undertook the most difficult position that any man in Rome had to fill, the control, as husband, of Augustus' daughter Julia. For nearly a decade he maintained his authority, and although during that period Julia was hardly a model of strict propriety, all open scandal was avoided and she completely fulfilled a wife's first duty of fecundity. To her husband she bore five children, three boys and two girls, and by 12 B.C. the line of succession in the Julian nouse seemed firmly secured. Agrippa's death

in that year was the beginning of Augustus' private and public misfortunes.

It has sometimes been noticed that the head of a great business seems to do comparatively little work himself, although he pockets most of the profit accruing from his firm's undertakings. He puts reliable subordinates in charge of each important department, and then, like some benevolent deity, watches their operations and

assumes the credit for them. The problem, of course, is to find subordinates who can be

safely trusted and whose interests are the same as their superior's; and if a man can secure these helpers among his own family or his intimate friends he is almost sure of success. Such was the position of Gaius Julius Octavianus (63 B.C.—A.D. 14), when once he had established the great new business of the Roman Principate. Maecenas managed home affairs for him, Agrippa and Tiberius fought his wars, Livia initiated his social legislation: he himself sat in the centre and pulled the strings.

But before this happy consummation was reached there were many dangers to face and many competitors to overcome. Augustus, to give him the name by which he is commonly known, was born an Octavius, the son of an obscure country money-lender. Luckily for him his mother was the only child of Julius Caesar's only sister, and consequently he was the dictator's nearest male relative. He was pursuing his studies quietly in north Greece, where he had just made the acquaintance of Marcus Agrippa, the young son of a farmer, when he received the news of Caesar's death. The two friends went to an astrologer, were assured that their horoscopes were favourable, and then, on Agrippa's urgent advice, they set off together for Italy.

There Octavian found that he had been left his great-uncle's heir, and received a warm welcome both from Caesar's veterans and from Cicero, who saw in him a useful stick wherewith to beat Antony. In a little while, however, the unknown youth of eighteen showed himself in all the arts of statesmanship more than a match for either Antony or

Cicero. Cautious and cold-blooded, he had signal advantages in dealing with two men one of whom was habitually intemperate in words and the other in deeds; but his handling of a situation which till 31 was fraught with difficulty remains a masterpiece of skill. The cool duplicity of his manoeuvres would be wonderful in an old diplomat: in a young man it appears almost unnatural.

Actium left Octavian master of the world, as Caesar had been, and, like Caesar, he was faced by the task of determining a new form of government. But he was far more careful of opinion than his predecessor had shown himself to be, and instead of seizing power he waited for power to be offered to him. By the year 27 all the details had been arranged, he accepted from the Senate the honorary title of Augustus, and the new principate begins. Like the old republican constitution, whose outward forms were preserved although all reality was taken

from them, it was based upon a convention. In theory the Senate appointed a perpetual president as supreme executive; actually the president either appointed his own successor or the choice was made by the army. In theory the government was divided between the Princeps and the Senate: actually the Senate became more and more of a shadow, and the Princeps gathered complete control into his own hands. It was a highly artificial system, but it worked; and it gave the Roman world for two centuries greater material prosperity than it had ever before enjoyed.

If Augustus had only had questions of government to settle he might have lived a happy life. But in common with many another man he found the women of his own household far more difficult to manage than public affairs. Between his sternly virtuous wife Livia and his gaily profligate daughter Julia he was cruelly torn, and when on Agrippa's death he married Julia to Livia's eldest son he destroyed all hope of domestic peace. He was compelled to exile Julia under his own laws against adultery, he saw his grandsons die one after the other, and finally the succession passed from the Julian house into the hands of Tiberius.

# TABLE OF DATES FOR CHRONICLE X

B.C.	A.D.
31 Battle of Actium. Flight of Antony and Cleopatra to Egypt.	19 Death of Germanicus. Suspicion falls on Piso and Tiberius.
30 Octavian follows to Egypt. Death of Antony and Cleopatra. Annexation of Egypt, which becomes the appanage of Octavian.	20 Death of Pto.
29 Octavian returns to Italy, where Maecenas has been left in charge. Confirmation of the Acts of Octavian. Temple of Janus closed, the Republic being at peace. Moesia made a Province.	20 Extension of the Law of Majesty (Treason); growth of the delatores (Informers).
28 Official restoration of Senate. Octavian assumes the obsolete title of Princeps Senatus. Reversal of all illegal Acts since 43 B.C.	23 Rise of Sejanus, the praetorian prefect.
27 Octavian formally resigns emergency powers but receives Proconsular 'Imperium' for ten years, with the title of Augustus.	23 Death of Drusus (Minor), son of Tiberius.
Distribution of Provinces as Senatorial or Imperial. The latter are held by Augustus with proconsular powers, and administered by the governors he appoints, legates, prefects, etc.	23 China: End of the First Han Dynasty.
Formal reinstatement of the Republic; actual institution of an autocratic Principate.	28 Tiberius withdraws permanently from Rome to Capreae. Sejanus supreme in Rome.
Augustus goes to Gaul.	28 Positius Pilate made procurator of Judaea.
28 Augustus in Spain.	29 Death of Livia Drusilla Augusta, mother of Tiberius and widow of Augustus.
28 Julia, daughter of Augustus, marries Marcellus.	31 Fall of Sejanus and extirpation of his family.
24 Augustus returns to Rome.	27 Death of Tiberius.
24 Augustus retires from the consulship, which he has hitherto held annually; but receives the Tribunician Power which he holds permanently.	Accession of Gaius Claudius Caesar (Caligula), son of Germanicus.
Death of Marcellus.	38 Birth of Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus (Nero, son of Caligula's sister Agrippina the Younger).
21 Marriage of Julia to Agrippa.	38 Caligula's Gallic and 'Britannic' expeditions.
20 Augustus in Asia.	40 Asia: Approximate date of Kadhphes I, Indo-Scythian king, the centre of whose power was established at Kabul.
Parthians restore standards taken at Carrhae.	41 Assassination of Caligula. His uncle Tiberius Claudius Nero, brother of Germanicus, is made emperor by the Praetorians.
19 Agrippa in Spain. Settlement of Spain.	42 Birth of Britannicus, son of Claudius.
Death of Vergil.	43 Invasion of Britain and conquest of the south-east by Aulus Plautius. Province of Britain created.
18 Five years' extension of Proconsular Imperium. Augustus confers Imperium and Tribunician Power on Agrippa.	44 Death of Herod Agrippa.
17 Augustus adopts his grandsons, Gaius and Lucius, the infant sons of Agrippa and Julia.	47 Ostorius succeeds Plautius in Britain.
18 Frontier wars. Gallic disaster of Lollius.	47-49 Caractacus maintains the British struggle in the west against the Romans.
15 Campaigns of Tiberius and Drusus, the stepsons of Augustus, in Rhaetia, Rhaetia and Noricum are made Provinces.	48 Death of Messalina. Development of government through the emperor's secretariat.
Birth of Germanicus (son of Drusus).	48 Claudius marries his niece, Agrippina, and adopts her son, who thus takes the name of Nero.
14 Birth of the East.	50 Caractacus betrayed to Ostorius by the Brigantes.
13 Agrippa sent to Pannonia.	54 Death of Claudius. Undisputed accession of Nero.
Five years' extension of Proconsular Imperium.	54-59 The 'Quinquennium Neronis'; five years of quiet government under Seneca and Burrhus.
12 Death of Agrippa. Birth of Agrippa Postumus.	55 Britannicus dies; suspicions of poison.
Campaigns of Tiberius in Pannonia and Drusus in Germany.	59 Nero murders his mother. End of Quinquennium.
11 Continued campaigns of Tiberius and Drusus. Tiberius compelled to marry Julia.	60 Suetonius Paulinus governor of Britain.
10 Continued campaigns of Tiberius and Drusus. Birth of Claudius (younger son of Drusus).	61 Welsh campaign of Paulinus.
9 Death of Drusus. Fourth Pannonian campaign of Tiberius.	Revolt of the Iceni under Boadicea; massacre of Roman colonists; revolt crushed by Paulinus.
8 German campaign of Tiberius.	62 Festus procurator of Judaea.
Death of Maecenas and of Horace.	63 S. Paul at Rome.
Ten years' extension of Proconsular Imperium.	64 Great Fire of Rome, attributed to the Christians. The Neronian Persecution.
6 Tiberius goes into retirement, in Rhodes.	65 Death of Seneca.
4 Death of Herod 'the Great.' Birth of Christ.	66 Great revolt of the Jews. Conduct of the Jewish war entrusted to Vespasian.
3 Disgrace and banishment of Julia.	Nero in Greece. Roman sentiment scandalised.
1 Gaius Caesar sent to the East.	Servius Sulpicius Galba plans revolt in Spain.
	68 Galba marches on Rome. Flight and death of Nero (June). Galba emperor.
	69 [Jan.] The legions on the Rhine proclaim Vitellius. The legions at Rome mutiny, murder Galba, and proclaim M. Salvius Otho. The troops of Vitellius invade Italy (April); defeat and death of Otho. Aulus Vitellius emperor. (July) The troops at Alexandria proclaim Vespasian. Defeat and death of Vitellius (December).
A.D.	70 Titus Flavius Vespasianus emperor.
2 Tiberius summoned from Rhodes. Lucius Caesar dies.	Revolt and suppression of Civilis in Gaul.
3 Ten years' extension of Proconsular Imperium.	Siege, sack, and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, elder son of Vespasian.
4 On the death of Gaius Caesar, Augustus adopts both Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus. Tiberius adopts his nephew, Germanicus.	Vespasian's ten years' (70-79) rule of peace, retrenchment and reform inaugurated.
Third German campaign of Tiberius.	77 India: Kadhphes II extends the Indo-Scythian power over the Ganges basin.
5 Tiberius reaches the Elbe.	78-85 Cn. Julius Agricola, governor of Britain, organizes the province, and carries the Roman arms over the Firth and the Tay.
6-9 Pannonian wars of Tiberius.	79 Titus Flavius Vespasianus emperor.
9 End of Pannonian War.	Herculeanum and Pompeii buried by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius.
Germans led by Arminius annihilate Varus and his legions in the Salus Teutoburgensis.	81 T. Flavius Domitianus emperor.
10 Tiberius with Germanicus in Germany.	83 Futile German expedition of Domitian.
12 Birth of Gaius Caesar, son of Germanicus.	86 Disastrous expedition of Domitian against Dacia.
Tiberius confirmed in Imperium and Tribunician Power, practically ensuring his succession.	86 Severe persecution of the Christians.
Germanicus remains in command on the Rhine.	90 Murder of Domitian. The Senate elect M. Cocceius Nerva emperor.
14 Death of Augustus. Tiberius Claudius Nero, emperor.	97 Nerva adopts Trajan, as colleague and successor.
15 Germanicus defeats Arminius.	98 Death of Nerva. M. Ulpius Trajanus sole emperor.
17 Germanicus recalled and sent to the East. Policy of imperial expansion definitely abandoned.	

## Chronicle X

# THE SHAPING OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE: 31 B.C.—A.D. 98

THE battle of Actium was one of the decisive moments in the world's history. It closed a struggle which, if the issue of the fight had been different, might have been indefinitely prolonged. As it was, the reorganization of the world empire was now in the hands of one man who still had five-and-forty years of life before him in which to carry out that tremendous task.

The triumvirate powers had not been renewed for a third term, but Caesar Octavian at Rome had been endowed afresh with extraordinary powers for an indefinite period, the equivalent of his uncle's official dictatorship, though that title had been abolished during Antony's ascendancy. This was the authority on which he now continued to act. He passed nearly a year after Actium in touring Greece and Asia and visiting Italy, before turning to Egypt, where the seal was set on his victory by the suicide of Antony and Cleopatra.

The first step following was the annexation of Egypt, which Octavian took permanently into his own hands, giving it no senatorial officials, but placing it under the administration of a prefect directly responsible to himself. The last independent kingdom west of the Euphrates, the granary of Italy, became Caesar's appanage; and the entire Mediterranean littoral from end to end, with the exception only of Mauretania, which as against Rome was powerless, was now under Roman rule.

For nearly a year Octavian remained in the East, leaving the West in the competent hands of the diplomatic Maecenas. The Senate had duly ratified his acts before his return to Rome in August, 29 B.C., when he celebrated several triumphs and signalled the restoration throughout the Empire of a peace long unknown by closing the temple of Janus. In the same year Moesia, between Thrace and the Danube, was officially added to the provinces

of the Empire. Again in 28 Octavian's rôle as pacificator was emphasised by the reversal of the illegalities for which he and his colleagues had been responsible during the long period of arbitrary authority, and a revision of the senatorial lists seemed at least to restore the traditional dignity of that body, somewhat besmirched in recent years; Octavian himself assuming the dignified functions of its *Princeps* (president).

The time, then, had at last arrived for Octavian to give convincing proof that public spirit, not ambition, was the motive of his life. In 27 he laid down his extraordinary powers. No one, of course, knew better than he that his retirement was impossible; he resigned his powers only that he might resume them in slightly different guise in constitutional form, in response to the urgent prayer of the Roman people, not of his own will as the master of legions.

### Caesar a Constitutional Emperor

THE titles conferred upon him were such as to concentrate attention not on his power and its bases but on his dignity, on the reverence he commanded from a grateful world. The Imperator is veiled in the *Pater Patriae*, father of his country, *Princeps*, its first citizen, Caesar Augustus—almost, but not as yet, divine. Henceforth we speak of him as Augustus.

What the powers thus conveyed to Augustus were, how they were masked, by a republican terminology and warranted by appeal to republican precedents, the reader will find set forth in the next chapter (Chapter 65). The weakness of the imperial position—not in that of Augustus personally—lay in the absence of any law of succession to the imperial authority. Had fortune granted him sons of his own he would doubtless have succeeded in making the succession hereditary, but the sole immediate heir of his body

was a daughter, Julia, and all but one of Julia's sons died before Augustus.

In spite of the closing of the Temple of Janus in 29 B.C., the Pax Romana, the Roman Peace, was not yet in fact established throughout the Empire; for the whole vast frontier line was constantly liable to attack from the miscellaneous barbarians surging upon it in Europe, and from the Parthians on the Euphrates; further, in remote parts of Spain and Gaul there were still tribes unreconciled to the Roman lordship. Aquitania, however, was brought to final submission in 27 B.C., the year from which the Principate of Augustus is dated. In the north-west of Spain the Asturians and Cantabrians maintained a gallant but vain struggle for freedom for many years, in the course of which Augustus took the

field against them in person with no remarkable success. It was only when the task of subjugation and pacification had been entrusted to Agrippa the unfailing that the stubborn tribes made an honourable and permanent submission in 19 B.C. Otherwise the wars of Augustus in which Roman legions were engaged were all on or beyond the confines of the Empire, and were waged against not subjects but foreign foes.

The East gave no serious trouble. The small dependent kingdoms still surviving in eastern Asia Minor and in Syria were pacifically and gradually absorbed into the Roman provincial system. Parthia under Phraates had no desire to challenge a military struggle with Rome. The unavenged disaster of Carrhae in 53 B.C., however, had always rankled in the



SCENES OF EGYPTIAN PLENTY FROM A MOSAIC FOUND IN ITALY

Octavian, with the burden of the legions on his shoulders, recognized that Egypt was potentially the richest province of the Empire, and retained it as his personal appanage, instead of assigning it to the Senate. Its prosperity had woefully declined under the later Ptolemies, but he inaugurated a wise policy of economic reform; and the famous 'Palastrina' (Praeneste) mosaic suggests the prosperity of the land in early Imperial times. Above, a scene in the Delta during flood time.

*Palazzo Baronale, Palastrina; photo, Alinari*



#### SUBLIME EMBODIMENT OF WHAT AUGUSTUS MEANT FOR THE ROMAN WORLD

Peace was what the Roman world above all longed for, and the success of Octavian and his system is best explained by this one fact—that he gave it peace. This splendid statue (its artistic significance is discussed in Chap. 68) embodies the feelings of his subjects towards him; he stands, majestic, already 'Augustus' in name and fact, wearing a cuirass on which the Earth rejoices in the blessings of peace, though a Parthian victory symbolises his frontier successes.

*Vatican Museum: photo, Anderson*



**OCTAVIAN AS VICTOR**

A fine bust of Octavian in the Glyptothek at Munich shows us a younger man than the 'Augustus' statue in the preceding page. The head is crowned with oak leaves, in reference to the award of the Civic Crown (see page 1864).

*Munich Glyptothek, courtesy of Dr. F. Slödner*

Roman mind; so when in 20 B.C. a demand was made, and emphasised by a military demonstration in force, for the

restitution of the captives and the standards which had been carried off from that fatal field, Phraates displayed his political wisdom by a ready acquiescence and perhaps even by an illusory form of submission which Roman poets were not slow to turn to account for the glorification of the Father of his Country.

On or beyond the European frontier, however, there were many campaigns. A German incursion across the Rhine defeated a Roman commander, Lollius, in 16 B.C., and called for the temporary presence of Augustus at the front, where he left the command in the hands of his stepson Drusus (38-9 B.C.), who was permitted to engage in an attempt to carry the Roman frontier up to the Weser or the Elbe. Drusus and his elder brother, Tiberius (42 B.C.-A.D. 37), had already been campaigning in Raetia, and the subjugation of the whole border belt on the south of the Danube had become a necessity. Drusus did in fact reach the Elbe before his premature death in 9 B.C., while Tiberius was establishing the Roman supremacy in Noricum and Pannonia, a task which occupied him for two years more. To Drusus had been accorded the complimentary title of Germanicus, which descended to the youthful son who is always known by that name.

Agrippa had been marked by his achievements as the man to whom the control of the empire would naturally pass if he outlived Augustus, at whose



**MEMBERS OF THE ILL-FATED FAMILY OF AUGUSTUS**

Livia Drusilla (left), first the wife of Tiberius Claudius Nero, by whom she had the future emperor Tiberius, married Augustus in 38 B.C. His daughter Julia (by Scribonia) proved profligate and unbalanced, and died in exile, A.D. 14. Agrippina the Elder, wife of Germanicus and grand-daughter of Augustus, also died in exile quite unmerited. The family life of Tiberius—we see him here as a young man—was marked by his unfeeling treatment of Agrippina and his mother Livia.

*From Poulsen, 'Greek and Roman Portraits', (Clarendon Press), Ny Carlsberg and British Museums*

## Shaping of the Roman Empire


bidding he had married the daughter of the latter, Julia, in 21 B.C. But he died in 12 B.C., leaving by that marriage two daughters, Agrippina, who was later married to Germanicus, and Julia, who followed her mother's profligate example, and two sons, Gaius and Lucius Caesar. A third son, Agrippa Postumus, was born just after his death. Of these three grandsons of Augustus, only the last survived him.

On the other hand, Tiberius (Claudius Nero) and Drusus (Claudius Nero) were, as has been remarked, the stepsons of Augustus, the offspring of his very able and ambitious wife, Livia Drusilla, by her former husband, Tiberius Claudius Nero; though Drusus had actually been born after her marriage to Augustus in 37 B.C. The explanation of these family complications is somewhat wearisome, but is necessary to an understanding of the course actually taken by the imperial succession. The three next emperors were all in fact Claudii, though only the third is known as Claudius, Caesars (like Augustus himself) only by adoption.

### Stabilisation of the New Order

**A**GRIPPA had done more than any other man to create and to stabilise the New Order; yet the stabilisation owed hardly less to the very different work of the second of the great ministers of Augustus, Gaius Cilnius Maecenas, who followed his colleague to the grave in 8 B.C. He rendered his services not as a state official but as a personal counsellor and a social influence, guiding Augustus in the way he should go. He was supple, skilful and conciliatory; by his discriminating but munificent patronage of art and letters attracting to the support of the new regime all that was best as well as all that was cleverest in the intellectual society of the capital.

Such was the outcome of twenty years of the Principate in 7 B.C., when Augustus stood alone and both of his great ministers were dead. Alone he was to stand for twenty-one years more. For, young children excepted, his nearest relative was his step-son Tiberius, whom neither he nor probably any other man ever



**MAECENAS, PATRON OF THE ARTS**

As Agrippa was Augustus' most trusted minister for the more active kinds of government, so Maecenas (died 8 B.C.) managed internal affairs for him. It is interesting to note that he was of Etruscan parentage on both sides.

*Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome; photo, Alfani*

loved or could love; a man, it would seem, of an unswerving loyalty, a general of tried capacity, but always morose and repellent; he was son-in-law now as well as step-son, since he had been compelled to marry Julia the Shameless on the death of Agrippa. But the principate was an established fact; none but a few doctrinaires could dream of a return to the old order, at least during the life-time of Augustus, though he was still in theory only a republican magistrate whose resignation or refusal of the functions imposed on him the Republic could not afford to accept.

The Christian world in a later age adopted a chronological system which reckons the years and centuries backwards and forwards from a supreme moment in the reign of Augustus, the humble birth of a Babe in Bethlehem of Judaea. The actual date was incorrectly assigned; for at the time Herod, curiously entitled the 'Great,' was still the dependent king of Judaea; the year which we call 4 B.C. ought to have been named A.D. 1.

On the death of Drusus, the principal command of the frontier fell to Tiberius,




whose campaigns had in 8 B.C. nominally completed the subjugation of Germany as far as the Elbe, and also of Pannonia. Very shortly, however, he went into retirement in the island of Rhodes. The hopes of Augustus for the founding of a dynasty seemed to centre in his two elder grandsons; both were introduced to public life at the earliest possible moment; but both died young (A.D. 2 and A.D. 4). He thereupon adopted the third brother, Agrippa Postumus—though the boy had shown no signs of either character or capacity—and also Tiberius, while displaying in a marked manner his personal dislike for both. At the same time Tiberius was compelled to adopt Germanicus, the elder son of his dead brother Drusus.

For some years Tiberius was employed on campaigns, in which his nephew was at

times associated with him, for the most part either in south Germany against the Marcomanni or in the turbulent province of Pannonia: campaigns in which he admittedly showed very high military ability in extremely difficult conditions, receiving only the most perfunctory recognition of his services. But while he was thus engaged in the south, there befell in north Germany the heaviest reverse to the Roman arms since the disaster of Carrhae. Three Roman legions under Quintilius Varus were entangled in the Teutobergerwald (*Salus Teutoburgensis*) between the Ems and the Weser—the precise position is uncertain—and annihilated by the Cherusci under the brilliant warrior known to the Romans as Arminius (A.D. 9).

For the Germans had learnt the lesson, as Tiberius knew well by weary experience,



**AUGUSTUS THRONED AS GOD BUT PATHETIC IN THE LONELINESS OF AGE**

During his latter years Augustus stood alone, his direct descendants dead before him, save for one weak minded youth. He was forced to turn to Tiberius, son of his wife Livia by an earlier marriage, whom he disliked personally but who was unquestionably able. This famous sardonyx cameo shows Augustus throned as a god beside 'Roma,' while Tiberius, on the left, steps from a triumphal car in reference to his Pannonian victories. At the head of his horses stands the young Germanicus.

*Vienna Museum; photo, Giraudon*



**'GIVE ME BACK MY LEGIONS'**

P. Quintilius Varus was in command of that part of Germany which had been subdued by Drusus when there occurred the terrible disaster of the *Salus Teutoburgensis*, three legions and three cavalry squadrons being wiped out by Arminius.

that it was to their advantage not to hurl themselves upon the drilled legions in the open, but to trap them. The victory of Arminius was a turning point. The meaning of it was that the Roman Empire would never succeed in effectually establishing itself on the farther side of the Rhine and the Danube. Tiberius might—in fact he did—march through Germany as he had marched before, without meeting a serious check; but to subdue it and hold it was beyond the power of Rome at her mightiest.

Tiberius was presently recalled from his task of restoring the prestige of the Roman arms in Germany, where the command was left in the hands of young Germanicus, who was as popular as his uncle was the reverse. Had Germanicus been afflicted with political ambitions he might have been a dangerous rival, but his heart was in the camp. The young Agrippa was impossible—probably quite incapable. And the disadvantages in the position of Tiberius were counterbalanced by the fact that he already shared, though as a subordinate to Augustus, a large part of the exceptional powers bestowed upon the Princesps.

Therefore when at last the old man died in A.D. 14 it was a matter of course that the Senate, still the nominal governing body, should petition Tiberius to accept the succession, and that he should do so, though with a show of reluctance not wholly fictitious. The soldiery had already sworn allegiance to him as emperor; the representatives of the old great families were men without administrative experience or military position—Augustus had seen to that; Germanicus was far away; Agrippa Postumus, who could never have been more than a figure-head for plots, died—so conveniently that men whispered of assassination.

Tiberius reigned for twenty-three years! The picture of that reign irresistibly impressed on our minds by the great Roman historian Tacitus, who was born some twenty years after it ended, is lurid and repulsive; nor can it be doubted that in certain of its aspects the reign was lurid and repulsive in actual fact. Nevertheless it assuredly had another side.

As under Augustus, the Empire at large enjoyed peace and prosperity, showing no signs of general disaffection. The



**YOUNG LEADER OF GREAT PROMISE**

Drusus the Elder was the younger brother of Tiberius and the most promising of all the family of Augustus; but predeceased him in A.D. 9 after winning the complimentary title of Germanicus that descended to his son.

*Naples Museum; photo, Brogi*



TIBERIUS ON A FAMOUS CAMEO

If the morose Tiberius on his accession (A.D. 14-37) proved a suspicious tyrant to the upper-class Romans, he was an admirable ruler of the Empire as a whole. And doubtless the stories of his debauches at Capreae, which we owe to his political enemies, have been much exaggerated. Above, Tiberius and his family; in the heavens, the deified Augustus.

*Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; photo, Giraudon*

provincial system worked under Tiberius, as it had worked under his predecessor, very much better than the old senatorial system: governors who were continued in office during good behaviour were more disposed to do their duty by the governed than men who held for a year a post out of which they had every temptation to extract the utmost possible profit in the shortest possible time with a minimum of risk; Tiberius was deaf to the beguilements of vested interests, popular agitation, or family influences. Therefore, in so far as the Empire was concerned, the reign of Tiberius confirmed and made permanent the work of Augustus. The organization was brought into such a sound condition that it survived the blighting influences of Tiberius himself,

the madness of Caligula, the feebleness of Claudius and the crimes of Nero.

But though no little ability, insight and resolution were needed to face imperial problems as Tiberius faced them, agitators, vested interests and upholders of the aristocratic tradition united in denouncing the man who in the eyes of the moralists was an epitome of evil, a well-spring of social corruption.

Apart from hard drinking, however, we hear nothing of the emperor's addiction to animal vices till after his retirement to Capreae in the twelfth year of his rule (A.D. 26), when he was nearing seventy; it is at least easy to suspect that by that time his brain had become not unhinged but diseased. Nor were the other despicable qualities fully developed in the early years. That he trusted no one was clear enough, until he fell under the malign influence of Aelius Sejanus, the ambitious and utterly unscrupulous Prefect of the Praetorians, in whom he did repose for many years a confidence as blind as it was undeserved. But the charges brought against him by the

voice of popular scandal of plotting and procuring the deaths of prominent persons whose ambitions he chose to suspect were never substantiated and were sometimes in themselves improbable.

Yet even from the outset such charges were readily believed and as difficult to disprove as to prove; the more so because of the rapid extension of the law of treason and the detestable practice of 'delation' which accompanied it, and which grew into perhaps the most hateful feature of Roman social life. Not merely overt acts of treason against the state, as hitherto, but words which could be construed as reflections on the Caesar were brought within the meaning of the law, and 'delators,' informers who brought forward charges or evidence which led to condem-

## Shaping of the Roman Empire

nation—as in such circumstances they generally did—were handsomely rewarded. No viler machinery of demoralisation could have been devised. Delation became a trade, and no man was safe from it.

Despite the development in the body politic of this particular disease, which, at least in his early years, Tiberius treated rather with sombre acquiescence than encouragement, there was undeniable statesmanship in his conduct of the affairs of the Empire outside Italy. He maintained on the whole a respectable standard in the provincial governments; and his own personal experience beyond the borders of the Empire had taught him the soundness of the testamentary advice of Augustus that those borders should not be extended.

In domestic affairs, the establishment of the personal supremacy of the monarch was the fundamental necessity. Like all monarchs similarly situated, whose personal prestige was insufficient to secure the needful authority, he made it his definite policy to repress the nobles and such of his own kin as were potentially dangerous, and to conduct the administration through creatures of his own; while even the semblance of political power was withdrawn from the 'people' in general, who had already come to mean no more than the populace of the capital. Even in this field he did in the main achieve his object; but it was at the cost of his reputation both for justice and for insight; and he paid the penalty in leaving behind him a name universally execrated.

As a result, the greater part of the history of the reign seems to resolve itself into a record of personal scandals. In its first pages, something of the halo of romance attaches to the young Germanicus, the darling of the legions in the

north, who would have tried to set him in the place of Tiberius if they could have won his own consent. But his heart was vainly set on the conquest of Germany, where he succeeded in retrieving the prestige of the Roman arms and inflicting

a heavy defeat on Arminius. But his military career was cut short by his recall, in A.D. 17, when he was dispatched to the East—through jealousy of his reputation and popularity, men said, but probably also because Tiberius had made up his mind that the Rhine, not the Elbe, was to be the northern boundary. While in the East he died in circumstances which gave some slight colour to the popular belief that his death had been designed, or at best connived at, by Tiberius, and his memory was cherished as a victim of the emperor's jealousy.

On the other hand, Aelius Sejanus is the accepted type of the vaulting ambition which o'erleaps itself. Succeeding to his father's position as Prefect of the Praetorian Guards, the 'household troops' stationed in Italy, he wormed himself at a very early stage into the confidence of Tiberius, procured the concentration of the Guard, whose units had heretofore been scattered, in a permanent camp close

to the capital under his own command, and established in the mind of Tiberius a firm conviction that in the Guards and their trusty prefect lay the sole security of the Princeps against the machinations of hydra-headed treason. By craft, by intrigue, by the fascination he had for women, he removed one after another of the human impediments to his ambition. For further security he induced Tiberius, in A.D. 26, to bury himself in the isle of Capreae (Capri) surrounded by the instruments of debauchery, leaving Rome



**THE YOUNG GERMANICUS**

Germanicus, a brilliant leader and very popular with his troops, might have succeeded Augustus if his loyalty to his adoptive father Tiberius had not prevailed.

*Lateran Museum*

and the exercise of the imperial functions in the hands of the unscrupulous favourite; while decent folk could find safety only in obscurity, or escape from the nightmare by suicide.

Undoubtedly the aim of Sejanus was to make himself *serire*, murder Tiberius, and seize the imperial authority, relying on the Praetorians. But in spite of his precautions the old man's suspicions were at last aroused. He gave, however, no open sign. In A.D. 31 a messenger, Macro, came from Capreae to the Senate, ostensibly to heap new honours on Sejanus, but with a secret commission which transferred to him from Sejanus the command of the Praetorians. The doomed man was completely hoodwinked. All unsuspected, Macro took over the command of the soldiers and made his dispositions. The Senate was assembled; the long preamble of the letters was read; the blow was reserved for the conclusion. Sejanus was to be deprived of all his offices and arrested for treason. The selected guards were at the doors; the mask was dropped; every man turned on the fallen favourite; the

mob clamoured for his blood and flung down his statues in the streets as he passed to his prison on the way to death. With him his kith and kin were exterminated, even to his eight-year-old daughter.

For the last eleven years of the life of Tiberius, the years during which he was sunk in the iniquities of Capreae, Pontius Pilate was procurator or lieutenant-governor of Judaea, while Herod Antipas (the slayer of John the Baptist), one of the brood of Herod the Great, reigned in the north. This is all that may be fitly said in this place of the Crucifixion; an event whose significance was wholly unsuspected for so long that Tacitus after seventy years was content to say of it no more than that 'Chrestus' was the originator of a most pernicious superstition among the Jews, and had suffered the extreme penalty of the law under 'one of our procurators,' Pontius Pilate.

#### Assassination of Tiberius

THE fall of Sejanus served only to relieve the nightmare, not to dissipate it. For six more years Tiberius remained at Capreae; at the last he was murdered (A.D. 37) by that Macro who had been his instrument in the fall of Sejanus. So at least it was affirmed by common rumour, which later associated with him in the crime the young prince whom Tiberius had adopted as his personal heir, and whose succession to the principate was assured—Gaius Caesar, whom all men call by his childhood's nickname Caligula.

Gaius was the third son of Germanicus. His two elder brothers and his mother, the elder Agrippina, were all dead. His sister, the younger Agrippina, was the wife of a noble, Domitius Ahenobarbus, and became about this time the mother of the future emperor Nero. Gaius, now twenty-four, had in his earliest childhood been the pet of his father's legionaries, who gave him his never-forgotten nickname from the imitation military boots which he was accustomed to wear. As the son of Germanicus he was certain of the support of the soldiery and the populace; there was no rival to set up against him, for his uncle Claudius, the younger brother of Germanicus, was without ambition and



CALIGULA THE MADMAN

Tiberius was succeeded by the young son of Germanicus, Gaius nicknamed Caligula. His reign (37-41) opened with such promise that it is only reasonable to attribute his later excesses to madness, following a severe illness.

*The Louvre*

was reputed to be feeble-minded, while Gaius was credited with all his father's virtues. He was forthwith acclaimed Princeps. Augustus on his death had been accorded divine honours; Caligula was applauded for refusing them to the dead Tiberius.

For the moment it seemed that better days were in store. Much was to be hoped from a prince who was young, popular and generous; who began his reign by liberating prisoners, recalling exiles, publicly burning incriminating documents, and flinging himself zealously into the unaccustomed business of administration. But after a few months Caligula fell ill, and he rose from his sickness in effect a madman; bereft of all moral sense but not of that distorted but occasionally acute intelligence which accompanies some forms of mania. The new nightmare was more terrible than that which had passed.

Caligula was possessed with the idea of his own divinity. He slew, it might be with some definite reason, it might be merely because he, had the fancy to slay, whether from blood-lust or as a mere demonstration of power. A sister died; none might mourn her death, for she was a goddess, but none might therefore rejoice, for she was dead. He inaugurated magnificent public works, and forgot them when the fancy passed. He resolved to conquer Britain, gathered his army of invasion at Boulogne, and then set the men to gather shells on the shore, and these he sent to Rome as the spoils of the conquered Ocean. He returned to Rome threatening slaughter because the Senate had not been sufficiently zealous in preparing for him a magnificent triumph—and there Cassius Chaerea, an officer of the praetorians at whom he had gibed, summoned up courage to assassinate him,



EMPEROR IN SPITE OF HIMSELF

Germanicus had a brother, Claudius, who was regarded as a witless recluse. After the murder of Caligula he was dragged forth by the soldiers and hailed as Caesar; and, though weak, proved a better emperor (41-54) than might have been expected.

*Vatican Museum; photo, Anderson*

with the aid of a few companions, in the fifth year of his crazed reign (A.D. 41).

For the moment the assassins escaped. As the news spread, the Senate gathered in haste; several of them were ready to press their own claims to the succession, to which none had any title; others urged that the moment had come for restoring the Republic. While they debated, the Guards took matters into their own hands. A company of them, tramping about the deserted palace, dragged a new Caesar from behind a curtain where he was hiding, carried him off to the camp, where

he was promptly hailed as Emperor, and marched back to the Senate, who had no choice but to obey their mandate. Thus was greatness thrust upon the alarmed and reluctant Claudius, the almost forgotten brother of Germanicus, who all his life had passed for a half-witted but harmless student.

The soldiers had chosen better than they knew. Claudius was at least extremely conscientious; his intentions were excellent, and his political theory, if derived wholly from books, was intelligent. The phrase applied to James I of England, whom in many respects he resembled closely, seems to fit him admirably: he was 'the wisest fool' in Rome, but he kept his wisdom for the state, while his domestic follies and foibles made him a figure contemptible to his contemporaries and ridiculous to posterity.

#### Conquest of Britain by Claudius

CLAUDIUS was already fifty years old when he began his reign (A.D. 41-A.D. 54). Throughout the period the Empire enjoyed general prosperity and there were few complaints from the provinces. Save in one important particular, Claudius held firmly to the principle that the existing border was to be maintained but not extended; yet the military expeditions conducted against the aggressive north-German tribes of the Chauci and Catti—who had probably absorbed the Cherusci—were completely successful, though not followed by any attempt at annexation. Within the Empire the practice of extending full Roman citizenship to favoured communities was actively developed. But the signal achievement of the reign was the organized conquest of south Britain and its conversion into a Roman Province.

In A.D. 43, 97 years after the second expedition of Julius Caesar, a fully appointed and efficiently organized army of conquest landed in Kent under the command of Aulus Plautius. The country from the Channel to the Tyne was at this time divided among a score or more of tribal kingdoms or confederacies, some of which acknowledged a queen as their head. Most of them certainly belonged to the Brythonic group of Celts, while the latest

comers in the south-east were Belgic Brythons modified by a German element. On the other hand, Ireland and the greater part of Scotland were Goidelic (Gacels). A general supremacy over the sub-kings of the south-east had long been held by the Catuvellaunian Cunobellinus (Cymbeline), who had recently been succeeded by his son Caradoc, more familiarly known to us as Caractacus or Caratacus, the Roman version of his name.

Much had been learnt concerning the geography, the resources and the internal politics of the island, through the penetration of traders and the intercourse between Gaul and Britain, in the century that had passed since the strictly experimental and investigatory campaigns of Julius. It was not, however, without hard fighting that Plautius drove the Britons over the Thames and forced the passage of the river; after which he waited for Claudius himself with some reinforcements to take the field and claim the honours of the inevitable victory which secured the Roman supremacy and the formal submission of most of the chiefs of the south-east. Roman military headquarters were presently established at Camulodunum (Colchester).

#### Stubborn Resistance by Caractacus

CARACTACUS, however, escaped to the west, roused the tribes on the Welsh border, and maintained so stubborn a resistance that his forces were only shattered finally in a great engagement in A.D. 50 by Ostorius, who had succeeded Plautius. Meanwhile an officer of great ability but of humble birth, Titus Flavius Vespasianus, (A.D. 9-A.D. 79), who was destined himself to wear the purple, had subjugated the south, westward as far as the Exe and the Severn, and a Roman frontier had been established from the Severn to the Wash.

Even now the valiant spirit of Caractacus had not been broken, though his wife and children had been captured. He escaped again, to the north. But he failed to win over the Brigantes, whose cautious queen preferred to seize him and hand him over in chains to the Romans in 51. It is, however, to the credit of Claudius that when the brave captive was sent to

## Shaping of the Roman Empire

Rome he was granted an honourable liberty, though he never returned to his native land.

The emperor's honest zeal for good government was displayed by an active attention to the law courts which the regular lawyers found embarrassing. But unhappily the feature of the reign most conspicuous to the public eye, and at the same time most offensive to public sentiment, was the influence exercised over him by the freedmen, for the most part Greeks, who won his confidence, and by the successive wives who plotted against his honour and his authority while they fooled him as they pleased.

Of the freedmen, the most notorious were, perhaps, Narcissus, Pallas and Felix, the brother of Pallas, who became governor of Judaea. Their rivalry did not prevent them from working in concert to their common advantage; they batted upon the secret—almost the public—sale of honours and privileges; but they were men of ability, who rendered useful service when it was in their own interest to do so, forming a sort of imperial secretariat quite untrammelled by class interests or social prejudices, which affected them personally not at all. But the fact in itself made them the more odious and their master or puppet the more contemptible in the common view.

### Agrippina's Evil Influence

ROMAN society was mainly divided between profligates and puritans; but the profligacy of Messalina, the wife of Claudius when he became emperor, disgusted even that society, while it gaped at the besotted blindness of her husband until matters reached such a pass that even his eyes were opened, and she met the death she deserved in A.D. 48. The place she vacated was secured by the emperor's ambitious niece—Agrippina the younger—sister of Caligula, widow of Domitius Ahenobarbus, the mother of the young Nero, for whom she was determined to capture the succession.

Claudius was the putative father of a son who had been named Britannicus, born to Messalina in 42, so the first step was to make him adopt Nero, who was



MOTHER OF THE TYRANT NERO

Agrippina the Younger, unlike her mother, was cruel and licentious. After marrying Claudius she secured the succession for her son by Ca. Domitius Ahenobarbus—Nero; for whom she was virtually regent until A.D. 59.

*Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen*

three years the elder. Agrippina was a very clever woman who pursued her ends with a perfect tenacity and an entire absence of scruple. In the training of her son she sowed the wind—and she reaped the whirlwind. At first her husband was brought completely under her influence; she had gained her position in alliance with the favourite Pallas; for a time all seemed to go well with her plans. Then other influences began to predominate; there were signs that the old man was inclining to Britannicus rather than Nero. Agrippina took counsel with one Locusta, a woman who bore an evil reputation as an expert in poisons; and Claudius died suddenly. Nero, not Britannicus, was hailed emperor (A.D. 54).

The new emperor, a Domitius by birth, had received the name by which he is known and execrated, one borne generally by the Claudii, on his adoption by Claudius. He was now sixteen; of his character little was known; he had been highly educated, and his tutor was a famous philosopher and writer, Lucius





ROME'S WORST EMPEROR

Nero was one of the few emperors who seem to have completely deserved their evil reputation. Born in A.D. 37, he was only seventeen when he succeeded; and his descent from the profligate, unbalanced Julia must also be borne in mind.

*Uffizi Gallery, Florence; photo, Alinari*

Annaeus Seneca (c. 5 B.C.-A.D. 65); but his mother was Agrippina. For five years the government was directed by Seneca and Burrhus, the prefect of the Praetorians, whose support had ensured the accession of Nero; five years in bright contrast to those which followed.

The young emperor did not interfere with the business of government; he left honest, competent and generally respected ministers a free hand, and his own official appearances were creditable. Britannicus died in circumstances sufficiently suspicious to give colour to the usual rumours, but that was all. A breach, however, widened between the ministers and Agrippina, who found her influence with her son slipping away, and tried to recover it by methods which only made the young man resent it the more. He became infatuated by a mistress, Poppaea Sabina, who hated Agrippina, and in 59 Nero murdered his mother.

For nine years Nero reigned as an unqualified tyrant, and then for eighteen months generals from Spain, from Gaul and from Syria fought for the imperial

succession, which finally fell to the plebeian but very capable Vespasian, whose services in the subjugation of southern Britain have already been noted; three other emperors having risen and fallen again during this year and a half. Thus was revealed the fundamental weakness from which the Roman Empire could never completely escape. So long as the troops held to their allegiance their Emperor was an irresistible autocrat; while he lived, there was no one to whom



NERO'S EVIL GENIUS

Poppaea Sabina was one of the worst influences in Nero's life. It was at her instance that he had his mother, Agrippina, put to death and divorced his wife Octavia. She died, after marrying the emperor, from his brutality.

*Olympia Museum; photo, Alinari*

## Shaping of the Roman Empire

they could transfer their allegiance except their immediate commander if he chose to accept it; once an emperor was firmly established with general consent he needed not to fear revolt unless he made himself wantonly intolerable; but the settlement of the succession lay with the soldiery and primarily with the Praetorians, in their camp near the capital.


The reign of Nero saw the confirmation of the Roman dominion in Britain from the Channel to the Dee and the Wash, by the campaigns of Suetonius Paulinus in Wales, and by the crushing of the great revolt of the Iceni in the eastern area under their queen Boadicea. Still more familiar is the story of the Great Fire of A.D. 64, when half Rome was burnt to the ground while Nero, as men said, gave himself up to the emotional joys of the thrilling dramatic moment, and then sought to recover his popularity with the mob by illuminating his gardens with a public display of burning Christians; on the pretence that those incomprehensible and therefore formidable Jewish fanatics had set fire to Rome. All Roman senti-



**TITUS THE MAGNIFICENT**

Elder son of Vespasian, Titus (79-81), in spite of his short reign, was one of the most popular of the emperors. He united clemency and moderation with almost Oriental magnificence, in contrast with the parsimony of his father.

*National Museum, Naples; photo, Andersen*



**BLUNT SOLDIER-EMPEROR**

The accession of Vespasian (70-79) marks a turning point in the history of the Principate. After the confusion of the conflict between Otho and Vitellius, he was elected emperor, not in Rome, but in the East, and by the army.

*Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen*

ment was especially scandalised when the emperor gloried in taking a personal part in public competitions which to Roman eyes were fit only for Greeks, or freedmen, as well as by the shamelessness of his vices, and his extravagances. No man was safe, whose character was a reproach to the emperor or whose wealth excited his rapacity. At length the cup brimmed over, and the old soldier Servius Sulpicius Galba (5 B.C. - A.D. 68) 'whom all men counted fit to rule—had he not ruled,' raised the standard of revolt in his province of Hither Spain in 67-8.

Galba, a rigid old warrior, marched on Italy. Nero found himself deserted on all sides, and sought refuge in an ignominious death barely in time to escape capture. Galba was hailed emperor, but displayed an injudicious niggardliness to the soldiery, who in consequence transferred their allegiance to Marcus Salvius Otho, once the complaisant spouse of Poppaea, and Galba was slain (January, 69) after a reign of six months. But the legions of the Rhine preferred their own commander Vitellius, for no better reason than the fact that he was their



**NATURAL DEATH CAST OF A VICTIM OF VESUVIUS**

Many of those who met their death at Pompeii left a perfect mould of their contours in the mud and scorific dust that formed their shroud : and it has been found possible to take plaster casts, gruesome and pathetic, of bodies that mouldered away more than eighteen hundred years ago.

commander; and carrying him with them they marched on Italy. Meanwhile in the East Vespasian and his senior officer Mucianus, with their troops, decided that Vespasian himself should rule.

The lieutenants of Vitellius defeated Otho's troops at Bedriacum; Otho duly

committed suicide. Vitellius entered Rome and assumed the purple while Vespasian was being proclaimed in Egypt and Syria. The troops in Illyricum sided with the latter, whose lieutenant Antonius Primus with his first army defeated the forces of Vitellius in the second battle at Bedriacum and marched on Rome. The final scenes are somewhat nauseous. In the end, Vitellius, whose most marked

characteristic was a repulsive gluttony, found himself deserted, was dragged from hiding and was hacked or beaten to death (December, A.D. 69). Vespasian himself arrived in Italy in the following year; but in the meanwhile he was represented by his younger son Domitian (51-96): his



**POMPEII DISENTOMBED FROM THE DUST THAT OVERWHELMED IT IN A.D. 79**

The reign of Titus is made memorable by one appalling disaster—the destruction of the flourishing town of Pompeii on the bay of Naples by an eruption of Mount Vesuvius in A.D. 79. Titus exerted himself nobly to relieve the suffering. But, however terrible the event, it was of great value to posterity, for the town was not blotted out by lava so much as entombed in volcanic dust, thus preserving priceless information about contemporary life. Above, Vesuvius seen from the Forum.

*Photo, E.N.A.*

## Shaping of the Roman Empire

lieutenants were loyal; there was no rival or possible rival on the scene; Rome only craved for the anarchy to end; and his full and formal recognition as emperor was a foregone conclusion.

Vespasian was the practical man of the hour. Like Marius, he was of the people, and in no wise ashamed of the fact. He had no ideals and no illusions. Like the founder of the Tudor dynasty, he looked upon the running of the Empire as a business proposition which had been badly mismanaged and wanted a new manager who would attend to business, repair the machinery, reorganize the staff, and make the concern flourish. He had been fighting, commanding troops, organizing, administering for thirty years; he was a shrewd judge of character; he knew the system thoroughly by personal experience; he had served among orientals and hyperboreans, and knew the empire from end to end; and so he took over control.

### Vespasian's practical Qualities

THE vices and extravagances of Roman society had no attraction for the economical soul of Vespasian; in his own household he set an example of simplicity or parsimony which reacted upon society at large, so that simplicity came into fashion. He scoffed at the intellectual refinements and affectations of his sons; but he knew quite well that they had a social value. He could chuckle over his own shortcomings and the shams which surrounded him. Titus, his heir, reproved him for an unseemly interest in a paying drainage scheme. 'That doesn't stink,' said the Emperor, pulling out a coin; and 'I'm turning into a God, I take it,' as he lay on his deathbed.

His hard-headed shrewdness was the best possible antidote to the corruption of the times, and a most salutary if occasionally vulgar contrast to the prevalent levity and recklessness; it made decency more fashionable than indecency.

Vespasian indulged in no proscriptions and no violence. His business was to restore law and public confidence, to conciliate all classes without pandering to any, and to hold the control firmly in his own

hands. He was well served by the men he appointed; his public works were directed to the dignity of the state and the welfare of the people; and his expenditure was economical not in the sense that it was parsimonious, but that it eschewed wastefulness and merely wanton display. He was not picturesque, but he was effective, and he gave the Empire, and above all Italy, the heart of the Empire, that peace and order which had been so rudely shaken by the clash of civil strife; he restored the sense of personal security which had been perishing under the latter emperors; and he gave a new stability to the imperial system.

### Civilis' Mutiny on the Rhine

TWO episodes at the beginning of Vespasian's ten years' reign (A.D. 69-79) demand attention. When he resolved to make his bid for empire, he was engaged in suppressing a great rebellion of the Jews, which forms the subject of another chapter (Chapter 69). When he moved from the East he left the completion of the task in the hands of his elder son, Titus. Here, then, it is enough to say that Jerusalem fell after a prolonged defence in September, A.D. 70. The Jewish people was depatriated and dispersed, and the event was commemorated in Rome by the Arch of Titus.

The second event was the revolt or mutiny of Civilis on the Rhine. Civilis himself was a Batavian Gaul, but like multitudes of the Gauls a full Roman citizen and a legionary officer. The legions were made up of Roman citizens, but were by this time mainly recruited not from Italy, but from the provincial citizens of the region where they were quartered, and the frontier armies were supplemented by the cohorts raised from the subject peoples who were not citizens. For the most part these 'auxilia' did not serve among their own kin but in some distant quarter of the Empire. The Rhine frontier, however, was exceptional. When Civilis saw the legions making and unmaking emperors, he saw also his opportunity for setting up an independent Gallic empire by means of the armies on the Rhine. The attempt failed, mainly because the Gaulish legionaries remained

loyal to Rome and the general population stood inert; but it met with sufficient initial success to call for its suppression by Mucianus (accompanied by the emperor's younger son, Domitian), a subsequent rectification of the strategic frontier, and the substitution of foreign for native auxilia on the Rhine.

Titus had been for some years formally associated with his father as emperor, and succeeded him as a matter of course in A.D. 79. He reigned for only two years, long enough to win a lasting reputation, hardly expected at the time of his accession, for clemency and generosity. He was emperor at the time of an appalling calamity for which there had been no precedent, the utter obliteration of the cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii by an eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79.

Leaving no son, he was succeeded by his brother Domitian (A.D. 81-96), who left to posterity a reputation as foul as that of Titus was fair. The satires of Juvenal and the epigrams of Martial give a most unsavoury impression of the Rome of that day, but the satirist can seldom paint a picture that is wholly true, since he necessarily concentrates on the evil and ignores the good that he sees. From the known characters of eminent men of the time—Agricola, Tacitus, Pliny—we know that it had become entirely possible to be neither profligate nor puritan without being in the least singular.

But there were plenty of survivals of the Neronic days, and Domitian himself seemed to make Nero his model when he was not posing as the champion of religion and reformer of degenerate morals. The combination of personal depravity with superstitious fanaticism is not uncommon, and in him was emphatically marked. It



**DOMITIAN THE OPPRESSOR**

Unsuccessful in war, of the most doubtful personal morals, cruel and oppressive towards the end of his reign, Domitian (81-96), brother of Titus, yet showed himself a not incapable ruler.

*Musée Communal, Rome; photo, Alinari*

drew him into the encouragement of vile parasites, the revival of delation and other black features of Nero's reign; oddly accompanied by sumptuary and social legislation of a puritanical kind.

At the outset Domitian coveted martial glory, but his participation in frontier campaigns on the Danube abated his ardour. Mucianus, when he marched against Civilis, had realized the incapacity of his princely colleague and carefully kept him away from the front. The most creditable feature of the reign was the Britannic governorship of Gnaeus Julius Agricola (A.D. 37-93), for which Domitian was not responsible,

though his jealousy terminated it prematurely in 85. Agricola, appointed to Britain in 78 by Vespasian, not only advanced the permanent effective frontier to the line from Solway to Tyne, but partly subjugated the lowlands of Caledonia, planted forts from Forth to Clyde, penetrated into the Highlands, and inflicted a heavy defeat on the northern clans. His administration of the province, moreover, gives him high rank amongst the best of Roman provincial governors.

Domitian excited less terror but hardly less disgust in his latter years than Nero. Rome endured him with growing anxiety and displeasure, but only one revolt was attempted. Lucius Antonius Saturninus, a distinguished officer in command of two legions on the Rhine, tried to follow the example of Galba, and had the warm support of his men, but in 91 was promptly overthrown by a loyalist officer. The only effect of the rebellion was to increase the suspicions and fears of the emperor and intensify the worst traits in his character. Bad as he was, no one wanted a renewal of armed contests for the position of

## Shaping of the Roman Empire

emperor. But, as in the case of Caligula, the third and last ruler of the Flavian house was slain (A.D. 96) by an assassin who had no political object in view, a freedman of his own household.

An Octavius, three Claudii and a Domitius had achieved or successively acquired the Principate on the basis of a legal fiction that they were Caesars. Even of such fictitious Caesars the last had disappeared with Nero. Four emperors had followed, with no other title than the allegiance of the legions under their command; but to all four the name of Caesar was given. Flavius Vespasianus, grandson of a small Sabine farmer or farm-labourer, had a fictitious descent from heroic ancestry concocted for him and, like him, his two sons bore the name of Caesar. That title, as well as the complimentary 'Augustus,' had become permanently appropriated to the Principate. When Domitian was murdered there was not even a Flavius, much less a Caesar, to succeed him. But the time had passed when the most fervent of theoretical republicans could dream of a return to the republican system.

**T**HEORETICALLY the prerogatives of a new emperor were accorded to him constitutionally by the Senate, though the Senate had repeatedly found itself reduced to endorsing the dictate of the soldiery. But now there was no ambitious general at the gates, and the Senate could and did assert its constitutional authority without let. It proceeded immediately to the appointment of a new Caesar, and, to assert the civil as opposed to the military character of the authority the more emphatically, it chose a purely civilian member of its own body, Marcus Cocceius Nerva (A.D. 96-98), of an old Roman family which for some generations had been established in Crete; a Roman of the old Roman blood, but a provincial Roman. It was a new departure, significant of the new imperial idea.

Nerva was not a born ruler of men, but he was a man of lofty character, wise and courageous. There was an immediate end of the grievances that had been growing up under Domitian. But

he also faced facts and realized the fundamental weaknesses of the situation. An old man, he had no heir, and the power of the Principate rested on the army. In the choice of his successor lay Rome's destiny. Instead of leaving it to chance, faction or intrigue, Nerva took it upon himself to nominate his successor.


The very able general now commanding on the Rhine was Marcus Ulpius Trajanus (A.D. 52-117), like Nerva himself a provincial Roman whose family had long been settled in Spain. In 97 the emperor adopted Trajan as his heir, and associated the general with himself in the full imperial authority. The choice was made acceptable by Trajan's already high reputation; it gave immediate promise of security, since he was in the full vigour of manhood; it ensured the loyalty of the soldiery, and it was more than justified by the event. The nomination was Nerva's legacy to the Empire, and in the next year, A.D. 98, he died.



### PREDECESSOR OF TRAJAN

A man of middling capacities, the Emperor Nerva (96-98) was yet one of the foremost benefactors of the Roman State; for recognizing his own shortcomings he appointed the great Trajan his colleague and successor.

*Italian Debt of Antiquities, Professor Halbherr*



#### THE IMPERIAL IDEALS OF AUGUSTUS REPRESENTED IN ALLEGORY

On the outside wall of the Altar of Peace (see page 1869) a frieze depicting a religious procession included portrait figures of members of Augustus' family (top). On the left is Antonia, turning to speak to her husband the Elder Drusus and leading their son Germanicus. The old man third from the right is Maecenas. On each side of the two entrances were allegorical bas-reliefs, one of them (bottom) depicted Mother Earth, with personifications of kindly breezes on either hand.

*Uffizi Gallery, Florence; photos, A. H. M. and B. G.*

# THE NEW IMPERIAL IDEA

How the Roman State was adapted by the Genius  
of One Man to meet the Problems of a New Age

By JOSEPH WELLS

Warden of Wadham College, Oxford, 1913-1927; Author of *A Short History of Rome*

THE great contribution of Rome to the civilization of the world was the conception of 'Imperium'—the authority, reaching even to control of life and death, vested in the Magistrate, who was at once the representative of the people and also the inheritor of the almost sacramental power of those who had been magistrates before him. The Republic had maintained this idea of the sacredness of authority, but it had put authority 'into commission,' if the phrase may be allowed; it had divided the powers among several magistrates, limited their time of office, set checks upon them by giving a right of 'appeal' to the people and by creating over against the Magistrate, the inheritor of old 'authority,' the new Tribune of the People, who could 'help' his electors even against the highest magistrate.

This compromise had worked well while Rome was a small state, where men knew all about each other, and where therefore old custom, the 'mos majorum,' was understood by all. But it broke down as the empire increased. The task was no longer simple when it was not a single city that had to be governed, but an empire; the safeguards imposed by the Republic were impossible in the provinces, and in Rome itself the old tradition was lost, alike in the governing class and in the mass of the citizens governed.

The Republic was failing long before it was superseded by the Empire; during its last half century of authority—from the outbreak of the Social War (91 B.C.) to the outbreak of the Civil War (49 B.C.)—five times at least it had been found necessary to concentrate all powers in a single hand, because the Senate was unable to perform the functions of government.

But it is significant that, though it was Julius Caesar who took the decisive step and overthrew the Republic by means of his invincible army, it was not on the precedents of Caesar that Augustus founded his power. Julius, indeed, was, as he is made by Suetonius, the first 'Caesar' in the new sense, the despot who rules because he claims to be the real representative of the people's rights and wishes; but Augustus, though he began his political career as the avenger of his great-uncle, and as the head of his great-uncle's party, professed to restore the Republic in 27 B.C., when the civil wars were over. When he—to use his own words in his official account of 'Restoration of his career'—transferred the Republic the state to the authority of the Senate and the Roman People, he had won his victory as a 'Triumvir for establishing the State' (a title given him by law for five years in 43 B.C. and since then renewed); but this extraordinary title he now 'laid down,' as a sign that the political crisis was over. What we call the 'Beginning of the Empire,' Augustus called the 'Restoration of the Republic,' and technically he was right.

It must ever be remembered that the Romans were the greatest nation of lawyers the world has ever seen; even in their revolutions they had observed precedents. Hence when the new method of government seemed to follow largely the precedents which had been made in the time of the Republic for ordinary citizens, and especially for Pompey, the Romans were able easily to reconcile themselves to the real change. It gave them what Rome and the Roman world needed above everything, peace and order; and when these blessings were





AUGUSTUS WITH CIVIC CROWN

Among the special honours bestowed on Augustus it was decreed that a civic crown—the oak wreath conferred as a military reward for saving a Roman citizen's life in battle—should be suspended from the top of his house.

*The Vatican*

secured, it is not surprising that the ordinary citizen was not careful to note that, under a combination of old titles and old forms, a completely new system was being introduced.

Before it is explained in more detail how this was done, it may be well to note briefly why this great political fiction was employed by Augustus; why he was willing to receive as gifts from the Senate and People the powers which he already possessed through his victories.

Two reasons especially may be given. In the first place Augustus never forgot that Julius Caesar, who had won his power by the sword, perished by the sword, and fear urged him to moderation. But there was another and a stronger reason. Augustus was not, like his great-uncle, one of the world's ablest men; he was not ambitious that it should be seen by all men how he could

Cast the kingdoms old  
Into another mould;

but he was emphatically a very great Roman; he had the genius of his country-

men for practical success in the highest degree, and so long as he secured the reality of power, he was quite willing to surrender the outward show of it. And he had also the genuine respect for old tradition, which may have been lost in Rome, but was still strong in Italy outside Rome; and it was in Italy, from the first century onwards, not in the degenerate capital, that the real Roman stock was found.

In theory, then, sovereignty was still vested in the Senate and the People, but in practice the authority of the people was vested in one man; hence the new form of government is often called a 'dyarchy,' and the name is not unsuitable, for powers were divided; abroad there were two sets of provinces, and at home two systems of justice and of finance.

What then were the powers which, authorised almost entirely by Republican precedents, Augustus took?

For a few years, from 27 to 23 B.C., he held the consulship with a colleague, but with various extensions of its ordinary powers, all of which had precedents more or less complete in the last century of the Republic. He was, in fact, already master of the Roman world, but the forms under which that mastery was to be exercised were not definitely settled till 23 B.C., and the Chief Pontificate, the headship of Roman religion, was only added to his titles eleven years later.

It is then from the year 23 B.C. that the imperial idea, as held by Augustus, takes definite shape. In that year the emperor declined to be again elected consul, but received the Proconsular Power ('proconsulare imperium') for life, while the Tribunician Power ('tribunicia potestas'), which he already held for life, was given to him in a new form, so that it is from this year that he dates it in all his inscriptions. The highest civil powers were given him in virtue of this 'power as tribune'; holding it he represented the popular element in the government; his person was 'sacred,' he could propose laws, he could veto the proposals of anyone else. Thus the emperor was indisputably supreme arbiter of and in control of all home affairs, and it was natural that Augustus, and his successors after him, should date their regnal years by their tribunician

power. Every Roman coin bears witness to this leading position at home; among the titles of the emperors always appears the legend 'Trib. Pot.' with the figure denoting how many years this position had been held.

At the same time control of foreign affairs was given by the grant of proconsular power. In virtue of this Pompey

had controlled the eastern provinces, with authority everywhere equal to that of the provincial governor, but with Augustus (again with Republican precedents) this authority was made 'superior' (not 'equal'), and it was extended to the whole empire. As the emperor received, in virtue of his proconsular power, the control of all the armies, and as their commanders (except in Africa) were all nominated by him, it was clear where all real authority in the state lay.

The proconsular powers, though the title was voted for life, were renewed from time to time for Augustus, five times in all, because in theory they were exceptional, and so might cease when the times of emergency were passed; but the grant was a mere form from the first, and to the successors of Augustus they were voted on accession once for all.

The formal position of the emperor has now been described in outline; before proceeding to speak about some aspects of it in more detail, it is well to note that Augustus did not use the actual word 'Imperator' to mark his official position; to do this would have shown at once that he rested on the army and ruled by mere force. This title was indeed adopted by him at the very beginning of his career, but only as part of his name, as his praenomen, 'Imperator Caesar,' inherited from his adoptive father, Julius Caesar. But so far as the new monarch had a title, it was that of 'Princeps,' a word which had been used, of course informally, for leading men in the time of the Republic; so good a constitutionalist even as Cicero used it of Pompeius, who in this title, as in so many other points, anticipates the position of Augustus.

In speaking of the powers of the new monarch, it is natural to deal first with

the army; for, however much Augustus might wish to conceal the truth, it was the army which had, as has been seen, overthrown the Republic and made Julius Caesar master of Rome, and Augustus himself by the victories of his army kept this position which he inherited from Caesar. The legions were all in ordinary times quartered in the provinces, and Augustus, when he divided the provinces (in 27 B.C.) with the nominally restored Senate, kept for his own share all the frontier ones, where a standing army was required, except Africa. Hence all the legions but one (the African) were under



**AUGUSTUS AS PONTIFEX MAXIMUS**

This fine statue represents Augustus as Pontifex Maximus, head of Roman religion, restorer of the imperial and spiritual power of Rome as well as of her political and material life. The Chief Pontificate was conferred on him in 11 B.C.

Museo delle Terme, Rome: photo, Mozioni



#### PRAETORIAN GUARDS IN PARADE UNIFORM

In the Civil Wars of the first century A.C. the rival commanders each had his guard of picked veterans. Under the Empire the number of praetorian cohorts varied from nine to sixteen, commanded in the name of the emperor by a 'praefectus praetorio.' They were the real basis of imperial rule.

*The Louvre; photo, Giraudon*

his control, and he nominated their commanders; as a reason for this division, he urged that the frontier provinces were the troublesome ones, and therefore he generously undertook the care of them himself.

The Roman army, with the important exception of the Praetorian Guards, who will be spoken of shortly, was kept on the frontiers, and it was now put on a permanent footing. Under the Republic the armies had been in theory enrolled for a campaign or a series of campaigns, and though they might continue to exist as a force for years, they were supposed to be dissolved when the war was over. Under Augustus the army became a definite force, its strength being fixed originally at eighteen legions, which he afterwards increased to twenty-five or twenty-six. At the same time a normal limit of mili-

tary service was fixed, and a distinct Treasury established, out of which the pensions of the legionaries could be paid on their retirement. This was not the least important of the remedial measures of Augustus; the imperial army kept back the tide of barbarism completely for at least two centuries, and for two centuries more it at any rate held its own, in spite of barbarian raids and occasional defeats. The importance of these four centuries for the establishment of Latin civilization in Gaul and in Spain, not to mention the civilizing of the minor provinces, cannot be over-estimated; still more important is the fact that under the protection of the 'Pax Romana' Christianity was able to conquer the Old World.

The most important of the provinces which the emperor undertook to govern were the three Gauls—all France and Belgium as far as the Rhine, with the exception of the south-eastern corner (the old 'Provincia,' the modern Provence), most of Spain, the

provinces on the north-east of Italy towards the Danube, and Syria, from which province the Euphrates frontier was watched against the Parthians. The extensions of Empire made by Augustus and his successors will be discussed later.

One branch of the army remains to be described, the already mentioned Praetorian Guards; their importance cannot be exaggerated, for they were above all else the symbol of what the new government really was, and they were soon to become the most important element in its continuance. Under the Republic armies had been raised in Italy, but never kept there; they marched to the provinces, and returned only to be disbanded. But during the last century of the Republic the increased importance of the commanders had required for their protection

a special corps; this had been gradually increased till, in the Civil Wars of the first century B.C., the 'Guards' of the rival leaders became an important part of their forces. Augustus, when he restored the Republic in 27 B.C., obtained leave to keep his Guards in Italy, though the legions were either sent back to the provinces or disbanded; their retention on the soil of the governing country showed, to all who could see beneath the surface, that the new government was a 'military tyranny.'

The word 'tyranny' is used here in the old Greek sense, as meaning a rule based not on birth nor on ordinary election but on personal powers. The 'tyrant' in Greece was not necessarily cruel, in fact he was often a man of high character and even popular; but he gained his position ultimately by force, and kept it by force. So Augustus without doubt and probably many of his successors were popular with

their subjects; on the Imperial rule whole the rule of the emperor based on force perors, at any rate for two centuries, was good and just, except so far as the Roman nobles were concerned. But it was a rule that rested on force, and the 'Guards' soon found this out. They had been quartered by Augustus in various parts of Italy; when his successor collected them in their great camp just outside Rome, they became a determining factor in arranging the succession of the emperors.

Before leaving the subject of the military forces of the Empire, it must be noted that all the soldiers took yearly the oath to the emperor, the 'sacramentum,' which established so firm a relation between the soldier and his chief that the name has been adopted by the Church for the great rite of union between the members of the Church and their Head.

In considering the civil functions of the emperor, we must speak first of his judicial power. It is important to observe that to the emperor, as the head of the state and the representative of the sovereign people, lay the right of appeal from all parts of the Roman world; S. Paul's 'appeal to Caesar' is familiar to all. This indirect jurisdiction was most important. The emperor himself did not at first exercise direct judicial authority; but

in theory he could hold a court of justice for the trial of offenders of high rank, and, though Augustus himself did not use this right, it became very important under Claudius, thirty years after his death. It is certain that this power of the Emperor as supreme judge was abused in the punishment of senators; the Imperial Senate paid the penalty for the scandalous partiality which had marked the later Republican Senate in dealing with criminals of their own order.

Another branch also of judicial power, as enjoyed by the emperor, is unimportant under Augustus, though it begins in his time—at least, in part. The emperor appointed a Prefect of the City with the right of summary jurisdiction, for the maintenance of order. This power, too, became very important later.

The second instance of divided authority in the civil administration was in the control of finance. While the old State Treasury, the 'Aerarium,' continued to be under the management of the Senate and its officers, a new Imperial Treasury, the 'Fiscus,' was set up alongside of it. Into this went the revenues of the imperial provinces, and out of it was defrayed the cost of the army. As the imperial treasury was managed by picked men, the emperor's own choices, while the senatorial treasury was under senatorial officers, elected largely on political grounds and changing annually, it is not surprising that the emperor had frequently to come to the financial help of the Senate.

The elections of these finance officers and of the other Republican officials went on in theory as they had done under the Republic; but, as was to be expected, the emperor had considerable influence in determining the results. Augustus professed to leave elections free, and when he canvassed in person, as he did regularly till he became old and infirm, he only did what great Republican statesmen had done before him. He 'nominated' his candidates, and they were no doubt generally elected; but he went further and 'commended' some at any rate of the minor officers—he gave them, that is to say, not only his name, but his 'influence.' It is not surprising

that candidates so 'commended' always got in; but it must be added that similar undue influence on elections had been employed by political leaders during the last century of the Republic. It is also not surprising that, as elections were becoming so formal, the successor of Augustus, Tiberius, transferred the right of election from the Assembly of the People to the Senate, and, as Tacitus observes, the people only 'grumbled in empty talk over the loss of their right'; the sovereign people in Rome had become a mob, caring only for the 'bread and circuses' with which the emperor was careful to supply them.

But in theory, it must again be emphasised, the Senate was a partner with the emperor in government, and it was at first arranged that

**Diminishing powers of the Senate** it should have the control of its own provinces, and also of

the administration of Rome and of Italy. In practice, however, even under Augustus, these administrative rights at home began to decline, because the Senate was continually failing to carry them out. It has been noticed above that Augustus, at any rate occasionally, appointed a City Prefect to maintain order, though this office did not become permanent till the time of Tiberius. But Augustus established permanently a fire brigade for Rome (the Vigiles), a body which, with its military organization, soon was found to be important for other purposes besides that for which it was originally established. He had also to set up a Prefect to see that Rome was adequately supplied with corn ('annona'), a most important function when, as has just been said, the Roman proletariat had to be fed, if it was to be kept in good humour. And outside Rome the emperor had to appoint special commissioners to keep in order the great Roman roads, at once the symbols and the instruments of imperial power, which started from the capital in all directions and were continued through the provinces.

Thus, even under Augustus, the original idea of the Empire had begun to be modified; it will be seen later how terribly it was altered during the first century of its existence. But it must

now be shown how great a success was achieved under it, and how necessary a change of government was.

Warde Fowler, in his *Life of Julius Caesar* as a 'Hero of the Nations,' draws a striking picture of the condition of the Roman world when Caesar entered public life. He imagines a cultured Oriental traversing the Mediterranean regions, and concluding, not without reason, that the old order was passing rapidly, and that the days of Rome as a great power, indeed as a state at all, were numbered. At home he would find corruption and disorder, the government impotent, all classes at variance, the slaves, who were at the basis of the social order, in revolt hardly to be suppressed; abroad he would hear of every frontier threatened, of the provinces being oppressed, of the sea in the hands of the pirates. And this evil state of affairs became much worse in the days that immediately followed.

Caesar—may we say an anticipator of Mussolini?—had for some years checked decay and restored security at home and abroad; but Caesar's murder had made things worse than ever. The weakness of a despotism is that no despot, however good or necessary, is immortal. We have no need to go to an imaginary observer

to see how a thinking Roman regarded his country in the decade preceding the victory of Octavian (who was to become Augustus in 27 B.C.) at Actium (31 B.C.); Horace, in some of his Epodes and of his earlier Odes, gives a dismal picture of his country 'rushing to ruin'; the 'Ship of the State,' to refer only to one of his finest Odes, the fourteenth in Book I, was drifting on the rocks and going to pieces.

Of the work of restoration done by Augustus at home it is not necessary to speak in much detail. The justifiable boast of the emperor that he 'found Rome brick and left it marble' refers to the work begun with the aduleship of his faithful minister, Agrippa, in 33 B.C., who, with true Roman thoroughness, repaired the drains, improved the aqueducts and put the temples in proper repair. The emperor also had the slave system of

Italy carefully examined, and reformed the 'ergastula,' the quarters (which provided worse accommodation than the prisons) where the wretched slaves had been kept. Later Augustus did what could be done by law to check grave immorality, to restore marriage to its proper honour and to encourage family life.


The evils of the Roman world, however, were too deep-seated to be cured by legislation, especially when the legislators flagrantly disregarded their own laws; but there is no doubt that there was widespread material improvement in Italy, and that the restoration of order allowed the sound elements of Italian life, and there still were many, to assert themselves. Horace's charming picture of the Italian farmer, after his work is over, ending the day in peace, and worshipping with thankfulness his household gods and the emperor, is undoubtedly true to life.

Augustus wisely saw that Rome needed peace, and the Altar of Peace, voted by the Senate in 13 B.C., is the great symbol that the Empire stood for this; its shattered remains, recently restored and put together, are a noble evidence how good Roman sculpture could be (see Chap. 68).

But he was also wise enough to know that the peace of the world could not be secured merely by sitting still. Hence to this peace-loving emperor belongs the credit of adding more provinces to the Roman Empire than any previous Roman, and of pacifying and organizing completely what his predecessors had incompletely won.

First he completed the circle of Roman dominion in the Mediterranean by annexing Egypt. This country was not made a province, but became part of the private property of the emperor (the 'Patrimonium Caesaris'). Its immense resources were at his disposal, and from its harvests came a third of the corn of Rome. It was so important that no one of senatorial rank was allowed to visit it without the emperor's special permission.

This annexation was carried out immediately after the battle of Actium, before the Empire was definitely organized. When this first task was accomplished at home, Augustus at once proceeded to his second duty, the final conquest and the settlement of Spain and Gaul. In Spain the stubborn Cantabri were transferred from the rugged northern corner of the peninsula to the plains in the south-east;



RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ALTAR OF PEACE IN THE FIELD OF MARS

Pacification and organization of the Roman world were the prime objects of the consummate statesmanship of Augustus, and the dedication of the Ara Pacis in the Field of Mars (see also page 186a) as a tribute to the work already accomplished by him in that direction was an honour expressly mentioned by him in his *Res Gestae*. The monument was a rectangular structure measuring about 38 feet by 34 feet, with entrances 11½ feet wide in each of the longer sides.

*Reconstruction by Durn*

and in Gaul the south-west region was finally reduced, and the Rhine frontier on the north-east definitely established. The work, as far as Gaul was concerned, was crowned by the introduction of the worship of the emperor at Lyons (Lugdunum) in 12 B.C.; to this further reference will be made at the end of this chapter; it is enough here to say that a centre was given round which the various tribes of Gaul might unite. It can be truly said that the foundations of modern France were well and truly laid with the imperial altar at Lyons.

Turning to the East, Augustus had to face a different task. The Roman arms in that quarter had been disgraced at Carrhae, when Crassus lost his army and his life (52 B.C.). The emperor by judicious diplomacy obtained the restoration of the standards which had there been

taken by the Parthians, and established a 'modus vivendi' which made the Euphrates, broadly speaking, the frontier between the two great powers. During the first century of the Empire, in spite of constant quarrels, actual hostilities were avoided in this region. But on the Roman side of the Euphrates there were still large territories which were nominally independent of Rome. Augustus appointed over these a number of dependent kings, generally Hellenised orientals, who gradually introduced Roman ideas among their subjects. The position of the Herod family in Palestine affords a good instance of this policy. It failed with the Jews, for their patriotism, supported by their religious enthusiasm, made them stubbornly resist Romanisation; the siege and capture of Jerusalem by Titus and the terrible massacres that followed the revolt



**GAULISH PRISONERS DESTINED TO GRACE A ROMAN TRIUMPH**

It was Julius Caesar who accomplished the actual conquest of Gaul and its annexation to the Roman state after nearly nine years (58-51 B.C.) of difficult warfare. Unrest, however, long prevailed, and revolts had to be repressed by military force until Augustus finally subdued the last resistance in the south-west and devoted himself successfully to the organization of the country. This terracotta relief depicts two Gaulish chiefs being carried away captive in chains.

*British Museum*

of Bar Kokhba in the second century were the result; as the Jews could not be assimilated by the Romans, they were wiped out so far as their native land was concerned. But the other dependent princedoms of Augustus passed in the course of the next century quietly into

it had been averted to some extent by the victories of Julius Caesar, who had settled once and for all that the Rhine and not the Alps should be the limit of Latin civilization; but his work in Gaul had not been completed, and, farther east, the Danube valley was still inhabited by



**BROKEN PILLARS FROM THE PALACE OF HEROD THE GREAT AT SAMARIA**

Samaria was incorporated in the Roman province of Syria in 63 B.C., as a result of Pompey's armed intervention in Palestine. His policy of administering new territory through the medium of dependent princes was pursued by Augustus, who gave his full confidence to Herod the Great as King of the Jews. Herod rebuilt and fortified the capital, Samaria, re-naming it Sebaste (Greek for Augustus).

The excavation of the accumulated debris has disclosed this colonnaded hall of Herod's palace.

*Courtesy of Palestine Exploration Fund*

the Roman Empire: Commagene, Little Armenia and Pontus are examples.

This policy of introducing Roman influence by dependent princes, without any haste to annex, had been the policy of Pompey the Great; in this, as in the foundation of colonies in the East, Augustus was following the example of his great Republican predecessor. It may be added that the British Raj in India has grown in the same way, or rather it did so in the first century of its existence. The native dependent prince paved the way for the British annexations, which culminated in the vice-royalty of Dalhousie. A similar policy was pursued by Rome in Africa, where the last of the Numidian princes, himself half a Roman, was sent to rule over the stubborn Mauri of the north-west corner, the region where in the twentieth century France and Spain have found administration so difficult.

But Rome's real danger lay not in the east or in the south, but in the north;


tribes of independent barbarians, and the passes of modern Switzerland were all in their hands, in whole or in part.

Augustus had begun the work of conquest in this direction before he became emperor, and when the organization of the provinces of the Republic was complete, he initiated a progressive policy, as well planned as it was bold. The centre knot of the Alps was first reduced, and, strange to say, two campaigns (16 and 15 B.C.) were enough to secure this commanding position, both Switzerland and the Tirol being secured. No doubt much of the success was due to the fact that work was found at once for the warlike mountaineers by enlisting them in the Roman army. Then the emperor ordered (12 B.C.) an advance on the two fronts at once, in Pannonia to secure the Danube as a boundary, and across the Rhine to improve the frontier by including within it part of Germany.



RERV M GESTARVM DIVI AVGV  
SVBIECIT ET INPENSARVM QVAS  
INDVAVS AHENELIS PILLIS QVAE SVNT RO

ANNO SVNDVIGINTI NATVS EXERCITVM PVLVATO CONSILIO EFFV VATA IMPERIA



#### THE 'POLITICAL TESTAMENT' OF AUGUSTUS

Shortly before his death Augustus distributed about the Empire inscriptions recording the chief events of his reign. One of these survives almost complete, though much weather-worn, in the Temple of Augustus at Ancyra—the modern Angora—its preservation being due to the fact that under the Byzantine Empire the temple became a Christian church.

The campaigns on the Danube frontier, hard and chequered though they were, were successful, but the line of Roman forts was not pushed right up to the Danube till a generation after the death of Augustus. The German campaigns, on the other hand, after almost attaining success, ended in a disastrous failure which undid most, but not all, of what had been accomplished.

It is necessary to dwell briefly on events here, for it may well seem strange that a peace-loving emperor, as Augustus certainly was, should have attempted the conquest of the vast region between the Rhine and the Elbe.

A glance at the map will explain his policy; the frontier made by the Elbe and the Danube, with the mountain circle of Bohemia between them, is a shorter frontier than that formed by the Rhine and the Danube. And it is also a better one; the weakness of the Rhine-Danube frontier always has been that Germany extends a salient angle (roughly modern Baden and Württemberg) between the rivers, and this angle faces directly at the spot where the second line of defence of Latin civilization is weakest. The 'gap of Belfort,' between the south end of the Vosges and the Jura mountains,

had already seen the Germans pouring into Gaul till Caesar drove them back in 58 B.C.; through that gap, when the Roman Empire was falling, horde after horde of barbarians poured into the fertile plains of Gaul. It is not for nothing that France has always strengthened the great fortresses of Belfort and Besançon.

Augustus by A.D. 6 hoped that he had reduced Germany as far as the Elbe; Roman roads were made beyond the Rhine, Roman traders were penetrating there, the worship of the emperor had been introduced (near Cologne) as in Gaul, German warriors were fighting in the Roman armies. The work seemed almost done, when the incapable Varus

allowed himself to be outwitted by Arminius, and lost his life and three legions in the Teutobergerwald (A.D. 9). He lost more, for with the defeat went Roman prestige and Roman hopes of civilizing Germany. How nearly she succeeded may be perceived when it is remembered that both the brother and the son of the patriot, Arminius, served loyally in the Roman armies.

This disaster happened five years before the death of Augustus. He recognized that further attempts in Germany were hopeless, and, prudent to the last, he advised his successors

in his will that no more extensions of the Empire should be attempted. The record of his life's work was left by him, stated with true Roman simplicity and dignity, in inscriptions all over the Empire; it has survived almost complete at Ancyra in Asia Minor (the inscription is well known as the 'Monumentum Ancyranum'). He could claim that he had restored peace and order at home and abroad, that he had increased the Empire and made it secure, with definite frontiers; that its finances had been placed on a sound basis. Augustus could assert, therefore, with all confidence that his work for Rome had been successful.

The weakness of all despotisms is, as has been said, that the good despot is only mortal; and in Rome despotism was particularly weak because, by the Augustan theory, it was only established temporarily and might be given up. Gibbon, in a famous passage, points out how illogical hereditary succession is in theory, and how valuable in practice. Why, he asks, should great soldiers and statesmen pay homage to a mere child? But, at the same time, he points out how the Roman Empire suffered from the lack of this principle; of the eleven emperors after Augustus in the first century only three escaped a violent death. The prize of empire was too great a temptation when open to any competitor.

Augustus saw this, and tried to obviate the danger by indicating whom he wished to succeed him. This he did partly by bestowing on those he de-

**Problem of the Succession** sired as successors, one after another, the hand of his daughter Julia, his only child, partly by securing for his heir-apparent powers like his own. The first method failed, mainly owing to the deplorable character of Julia. There would have been in any case rivalry between the Julian and the Claudian branches of the imperial house, between Julia's children and those of her step-mother, Livia (the third wife of Augustus), who had two sons by a previous husband, but unfortunately none by the emperor. Julia's disgraceful immorality, which in the end alienated even her father, added a bitterness to this rivalry, and the fifty years after the death of Augustus saw example after example of its fatal fruits. It is charitable to hope that Julia was a physical degenerate, and that the emperors who were her direct descendants, Gaius (Caligula) and Nero, were not wholly responsible for their bestial lust and cruelty. Roman lack of morals did indeed revenge itself on the imperial house; Julius Caesar and Augustus each had as legitimate issue but one daughter; and after them the childlessness of so many of the emperors was one cause of the disastrous uncertainty of the succession.

For the moment, however, Augustus was able to mark out his successors, and

in his stepson, Tiberius, whom, much against his will, he was obliged finally to make his heir, he left as Princeps a man of great ability. Tiberius, when the emperor died, had already been granted both the 'power of the tribune' and the 'authority of the proconsul,' and so had legal powers to control events both in Rome and in the provinces. As to the character of this emperor historians differ; Tacitus has left a masterly picture of him as the ideal tyrant, cruel, greedy, hypocritical, unforgiving; but the best modern historians see in him rather a man soured by the ill-treatment he had received from Augustus and from his wife Julia, and rendered still more bitter by the later misfortunes in his own family.

**Divergent estimates of Tiberius**

It is, however, unnecessary here to trace the tragic history of the family of Augustus till it disappeared finally in the 'year of the Four Emperors' (68 A.C.), leaving the Empire the prize of any successful soldier, since this has already been done in Chronicle X. But it is necessary to trace how gradually the fictions of the Augustan system fell away, and how the despotism of the emperors was more and more revealed as resting on military force.

It has already been mentioned that Augustus was compelled on several occasions to appoint a Prefect of the City, whose office became permanent under his successor; also how the Imperial Court of Justice became a grim reality under emperors after Augustus. The special charge which was brought in it against high-class criminals was that of 'majestas' (treason—the name still survives in jurisprudence as 'lèse-majesté'). Prosecutions for 'treason' had been established under the Republic for the protection of the state magistrates; but under Augustus the grounds for the charge were seriously extended; 'words' as Tacitus says, 'now became sufficient evidence of guilt; overt acts were no longer necessary for conviction.'

Before the end of the reign of Tiberius, it was seen how serious this extension was; the most frivolous pretexts were enough to secure conviction; thus in



All the shipping agents and commercial corporations of Ostia concerned in the feeding of the metropolis were centralised so as to be under government control. The ruins shown here are of the inner colonnaded court of one of the immense warehouses at Ostia in which the grain brought from Sicily, Egypt and Africa was stored before being re-shipped in barges up the Tiber to the capital.

*Photo, Gismondi*



Ostia—'River Mouths'—on the left arm of the Tiber, is said to have been founded by Ancus Marcius in the seventh century B.C. It early became the emporium of Rome's oversea trade, and at the beginning of the Empire was of supreme importance as the harbour through which the corn supply reached Rome. In the reign of Claudius Ostia was replaced by Portus Augusti on the right arm of the river, its harbour being silted up by alluvial deposits from the Tiber

**AIR VIEW OF RUINED OSTIA, ONCE THE MARITIME PORT OF ROME**

one well known case an unlucky poet was put to death for writing a premature elegy on the emperor's son, who was dangerously ill but recovered. The poet's vanity had not allowed him to suppress his verses, and he paid with his life for his indiscretion. It is only fair to the emperor to add that he disapproved of this sentence, which had been pronounced by the Senate in his absence, and that steps were taken to prevent such hurried executions in future.

Corresponding to the development of imperial jurisdiction, encroachment by the emperor on the other functions left to the Senate proceeded consistently; this took place especially under Claudius. Under him the Imperial Civil Service became more and more important; and, as Roman pride prevented free-born citizens becoming the emperor's servants, power fell to a dangerous extent into the hands of his freedmen, and especially of those in charge of finance, of correspondence, and of the petitions presented to him. An imperial servant also took charge of Ostia, an all-important post, for through Ostia came the corn which kept the Roman mob alive and in good temper.

When these encroachments were being made in Rome, it is not surprising that a similar process was going on in the provinces. The command of the African army was taken away from the Senate's official, and so the emperor made complete his control of the armed forces of the state. But the increased imperial power in the provinces was associated with a development with which the most devoted lovers of liberty will sympathise. 'Liberty' under the Republic had meant for the Senate the power to govern others, and especially the provincials,

for its own advantage; the emperor revived the old principle of Rome, that of gradual enfranchisement of subjects. Julius Caesar had enrolled Gauls freely in his legions and had admitted provincials to the Senate; the conservative Augustus had 'purged' the Senate, and did his best to hinder enfranchisement; but the process went on all the same, and under Claudius became the regular imperial policy.

The aristocratic philosopher Seneca gibes at Claudius for this in his bitter satire (the *Apokolokuntosis*), written after the emperor's death (when it was safe to kick a dead lion); the world has laughed at it from that time to this, but it has nevertheless done justice to the butt, while it treats the satirist with contempt.

The progress of the Empire and the development of the emperor's powers went on steadily; but, except in the case of Claudius, it is doubtful if the encroachment was deliberate on the part of the emperors. Tiberius was too old and cautious to make this his aim, at any rate at first; Gaius and Nero were mainly intent on satisfying their appetite for bestial pleasures and their colossal vanity, and on getting the money necessary

for this. Claudius was a statesman; he not only enfranchised many in the provinces, but also materially enlarged the Roman Empire, adding five new provinces. Most of his work in this direction was only the completion of the work of Romanising mentioned above; under him, for example, Judaea lost finally its nominal independence. But one of his annexations marked a new and bold policy; it was under Claudius that the plans of Julius Caesar against Britain were revived; the legions crossed the Channel, and by the time of the death of Claudius the south



#### EMPIRE PERSONIFIED

All the pride of Roman empire is embodied in this grave, commanding figure with the world held in the hollow of his hand.



ALTAR WITH LARES OF AUGUSTUS

Augustus' personal popularity greatly facilitated the general acceptance of his worship in conjunction with that of the local Lares. On this altar the figure holds a branch of laurel, proper to the Lares of Augustus.

*Museo Campidoglio; photo, Mascioni*

and part of the east of Britain had been really subdued, although the power of the conquerors was rudely shaken for a brief space by the revolt of Boadicea (Boudicca), which took place in the reign of Nero (A.D. 64).

With Nero's death came the collapse of the Julio-Claudian dynasty. The army had already shown its power, when the Guards made Claudius emperor in A.D. 42; on the death of Nero the legions showed that they, too, wished to take a share in emperor-making, and a year of civil war was necessary to determine who was the strongest.

With the victory of Vespasian began a new period of the Empire, which lasted for a century, and was its golden age, interrupted only by the reign of Domitian (A.D. 79-94). Conditions in Rome had very largely changed in the last half century; the old senatorial nobility had almost perished, either by imperial

cruelty, or in the civil war, and a Senate of new men, prepared to work with the emperor, had been created by Vespasian; of these Trajan, who was Spanish born, the first emperor from the provinces, and Agricola, who made Roman rule in Britain a reality by conciliation as much as by conquest, are examples. And with this change there went others as important. The imperial agents took over completely the control of the finance of the Empire; the armies, too, were henceforth mainly recruited not in Italy but from among Romans in the provinces, and the 'auxilia,' Rome's provincial troops, corresponding to the British native forces in India, were brought under better control. Wise adoptions by four emperors in succession gave Rome a series of good rulers, and the second century A.D. saw great prosperity all over the Roman world; it is to this period that Mommsen's famous judgement refers, when he speaks of this century as being, for the regions contained in Rome's empire, the happiest the world has ever seen.

It is then not to be wondered at that the gratitude of the world found its expression in a form which, to modern minds, seems equally unreasonable and outrageous—in the deification of its rulers.

The line between godhead and humanity was not drawn so sharply in the classical world as it was by the Jew; the old mythology was full of stories of inter-  
Deification of Great Rulers  
 course between gods and men, and many families, as that of Julius Caesar himself, professed to trace descent from a divine ancestor or ancestress. Greece, four centuries before the Christian era, had begun to offer worship to its great men, and though Alexander the Great, according to the best historians, never ordered divine honours for himself, they were spontaneously offered to him by his subjects in his lifetime, and he himself was disposed to claim a divine father. His successors went further; they deified him, and almost at once claimed the same honour for themselves and the members of their families.

When Greece thus deified its rulers, it was not likely that Rome, which took her philosophy and her literature from

Greece, would hesitate to do the same. The idea of worshipping the dead was not unfamiliar to the Romans; the spirits of deceased ancestors—the *Manes*—had always been closely associated by them with their household gods; hence when, early in the second century B.C., they came in contact with the philosophic romance of Euhemerus, his shallow doctrines found wide acceptance, when he professed to tell how, as a traveller, he had discovered old inscriptions which spoke of the Olympian gods as having once been men.

Intercourse, therefore, with Greece and the East made deification a usual form of flattery for rulers; hence when Republican officers were offered divine honours in the East, they accepted them, and the custom spread to Italy. Both Marius and Sulla received worship, and when Julius Caesar was master of Rome, he frankly accepted the same position, and Mark Antony became his 'flamen' or priest. Mark Antony himself had no hesitation in claiming divine honours in the East. Indeed, in his good and in his bad qualities alike, he resembled Julius more than Octavian, the adopted nephew, resembled him; but he exaggerated an imitation of his great leader into a caricature.

Augustus was much more cautious; though he was quite willing that his uncle

Augustus' attitude  
towards deification

should become 'Divus Julius,' for himself he accepted no direct divine honours. Inscriptions indeed tell us that these were paid direct to him in many parts of Italy (at Pompeii, for example), but they were spontaneous and unofficial. The worship of the emperor as established by himself was only indirect, so far as Rome and Italy were concerned, while in the provinces it was joined with that of the City of Rome. These two kinds of worship must be spoken of separately, for they were distinct in method, and to some extent in purpose.

In Italy the officially recognized worship was intended to link the name and honour of the emperor to Rome's oldest rites, but not to supersede them. By doing this the emperor was able to enlist on his side new classes, and especially to

identify his cult with the religious ideas of the Italian people. One of the main ideas of the ordinary Italian was the belief in his *Genius*, a sort of double self, distinct and yet largely identical (see Chap. 60). Augustus took advantage of this to introduce the worship of his own *Genius*. In this form he was joined with the *Lares*, the household gods, of individuals; and, even more significantly, he was joined with the local *Lares*, who were worshipped at the *Compitalia*, 'the cross roads,' in each district of Rome. Clodius had used these in the last century of the Republic to organize round them his 'operae'—his army of disorder; Augustus with consummate skill united his own worships with these popular rites, thus extending his influence among the poorer citizens. A priesthood in the 'compitalicia' was a coveted distinction, and so an opening was given to the ambitious among the lower classes. As has been said before, Augustus was really popular with the mass of the people, and hence the worship of him in this way found easy acceptance.

Spread of worship  
of Augustus

Less distinctly religious, but still definitely connected with the worship of the emperor, was the institution of the order of the *Seviri* in the municipalities of Italy and the provinces; by this the wealthy freedmen, like their poorer brethren just mentioned, were connected with the emperor. And it must also never be forgotten that Augustus did his best to restore the old cults of Rome, as well as to link his new cult with them. He was a builder and a rebuilder of temples, and a reviver of ancient rites, of which the famous Secular Games were an example. The genius of the Roman poets also was employed by the emperor to bring the Roman people back to their old religion.

In the provinces a more direct method was employed. If Republican proconsuls had been worshipped, it was obvious that similar honours must be paid to the ruler, whose power included and overshadowed that of all proconsuls. Hence in 29 B.C. the worship of Augustus was definitely introduced by him in Asia—at Pergamum—for the provincials; the Roman citizens in that province were to worship the

'Divine Julius'; but with Augustus was coupled the Urbs Roma.

The example thus set was followed generally in the East in the time of Augustus; in the West it came in more gradually, and often at first there was only an altar (an 'Ara') to him, such as has been mentioned above with reference to Gaul and in Germany. After the death of Augustus, this direct provincial worship was almost everywhere set up at once; Africa, above all things the province of the Senate, was the last to establish it.

The aims of Augustus in introducing his cult into the provinces were threefold. First, he wished to discourage indirectly the national worships of his subjects, which were always liable to foment national feeling; the Germans especially, as Tacitus tells us, objected to worshipping a mortal. A good instance of this purpose is seen in Gaul, where the festival of Augustus coincided with that of the Gallic sun god, who was thus thrown into the shade.

Secondly, the worship of the emperor tended to unite the different parts of the Empire. Augustus knew well that while the material basis of unity was strong, the moral base was weak. Hence he tried to supply this artificially.

Again, as in Rome for the poorer classes, so in the provinces for the honoured and the wealthy, the priesthood of the emperor became a coveted distinction, a badge of honour. The 'Asiarchs,' who protected S. Paul at Ephesus, were men marked out as honourable by their having been of the priesthood of Augustus. It should be added that this led indirectly to important and unintended results. When the leading men of a province met regularly to worship the emperor, they were likely to begin to discuss other matters too; this actually happened, and the provincial diets (if they may be so called) thus formed became important in the government of their provinces, forming as they did a kind of representative body.

To some extent the emperor's plans succeeded. The worship of the emperor met a real need in the Empire, and it remained important till Paganism went down before Christianity. The two great

religions against which this new religion had to contend were emperor worship on the institutional side and, on the emotional side, the cult of Mithras. Hence the test which was applied everywhere to try a Christian was whether he would sacrifice to the emperor; tens of thousands of martyrs suffered because they would not burn incense to this human god. This horror is prominent in the Book of Revelation, where 'Satan's Seat' is at Pergamum, the city in which Augustus had established the temple mentioned above.

But, in spite of this, it must always be remembered that on the whole the Roman Empire persecuted little. The cruelties of Nero, and perhaps of Domitian, to the Christians were largely confined to Rome; in the provinces the Christians were often unmolested for long periods together, and when they suffered, it was more often to please the mob than by the orders of the emperor. It was not till the end of the third century that Diocletian began his great and universal persecution. One of the marked features in the story of the spread of early Christianity is the good character of the Roman governors; it is only necessary to refer to those who are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, and both S. Paul and S. Peter are full of exhortations that lawful authority should be obeyed. Felix, who is the exception to the above rule, is condemned by Tacitus even more severely than by S. Luke.

With all its faults the Roman Imperial Idea has been one of the greatest forces in world civilization. It

preserved much of the best in the Old World; how rich this was in the conveniences of life can be judged from the remains still existing after 1,500 years of destruction, and it is significant how many of these, as inscriptions tell us, were gifts due to the liberality of public-spirited citizens. It helped also to educate the barbarians who overthrew it; they were ever conscious of the greatness of Rome the Immortal, and were willing to learn from her. Like her roads and her buildings, her laws and her institutions survived to a large extent for the use and the instruction of her conquerors.

# THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND ITS LITERATURE

One of the most Potent Forces that can be discerned at Work in the Civilized World

By J. WIGHT DUFF D.Litt. LL.D.

Professor of Classics, Armstrong College, Newcastle upon-Tyne; Author of A Literary History of Rome, Writers of Rome, etc.

THERE are few more marvellous stories than that of the Latin language. An account of its ultimate origin takes one far back into primeval times, and its history is not at an end even to-day. It is a fascinating task to consider, if merely in outline, how the dialect spoken by a comparatively small number of Italic peasants inhabiting the plains of Latium near the Tiber some twenty-six centuries ago not only grew into the speech of all Italy, but became the instrument for one of the noblest of literatures and the official language of the greatest empire of the past. Nor does the wonder cease with that; for besides the fact that Latin has long outlived the Roman Empire and maintained a separate existence in the service of learning and religion, it has also proved to be the actual ancestor of a great portion of the languages of modern Europe, while of the rest none, whether of Celtic or Germanic or Slavonic descent, can claim to be entirely independent of its influence upon their vocabulary within historic times.

About the Latin language in a strict philological sense we now know infinitely more than the most scholarly of the Romans could know; and yet many of them were keenly interested in their language. Early authors like Ennius, Accius and Lucilius concerned themselves with grammar as well as poetry; Varro recorded much of significance in his *De Lingua Latina* (On the Latin Language), though its etymologies may be ludicrous. Julius Caesar devoted intervals between campaigns to linguistic investigation, and the emperor Claudius suggested improvements on the alphabet. Under the Empire a succession of scholars,

by their inquiries, illustrated correct or incorrect, current or obsolete usage.

But it was not till after the linguistic value of Sanskrit had been brought home to European scholars by Sir W. Jones in 1786 that the application of the comparative method to the science of philology enabled scholars in the nineteenth century to indicate clearly the place of Latin among the Indo-European or Aryan family of languages. Since the days of Grimm and Benfey, two generations of philologists have expended enormous pains on such problems as

the affinities between Latin and other Indo-European languages,

**Affinities of Latin  
with other languages**

its position among Italic dialects, its archaic remains, its history during succeeding literary periods, the operation of phonetic laws and of analogy in effecting changes, and the rise of the existing Romance languages — Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Provençal and French, Romansch and Rumanian.

The closest affinities of Latin among the Indo-European languages are with Greek and Celtic, though it is of vital importance also to compare and explain the forms which the same original word may take in others, such as Germanic, or Sanskrit, the literary language of the Brahmans from about 1500 B.C.—the Latin of India, as it may be called. Thus a philological eye finds a world of meaning in a series of words like Sanskrit 'daça'; Greek 'deka'; Latin 'decem'; Gothic 'taibun'; English 'ten'; German 'zehn.'

Independently of the profound literary influence of Greek upon Latin, the two languages illustrate each other partly by similarity, partly by difference, in their



treatment of Indo-European sounds which they inherited in common. Thus, there is a notable parallelism in verb-inflections: the termination of the passive participle in Greek ('-menos'), for example, throw light on Latin forms like 'alumnus' (which equals 'al-o-menos', i.e. 'nurtured'). On the other hand, one typical difference in the treatment of original sounds is seen in the Latin fondness for changing 's' between vowels into 'r' (e.g. 'Valesius' into 'Valerius'), whereas the Greek intervocalic 's' tended to disappear.

One comes next to the relation between Latin and other languages spoken in ancient Italy. Some of these, Messapian,

Venetic, Ligurian (which may be akin to the Basque), and

Etruscan—still a philological enigma, but according to many an Eastern importation; see, however, Chap. 38—do not directly concern us here, though Etruscan left its mark on Latin in proper names and words connected with religion and the state. It is disputed whether the Latins got their means of writing direct from the Greeks of Cumae or from the twenty-six-letter alphabet borrowed from the Greeks by Etruria. Greek, already noticed as a prehistoric congener of Latin, was the actual language of many flourishing colonies in southern Italy and Sicily. Just as the Romans were a people of mixed descent, so their language showed alien influence in its loan-words.

The very considerable debt in vocabulary to Greece was symptomatic of contact with a highly civilized race of merchants and thinkers. Such borrowed Greek words as 'balneae' (baths), 'epistula' (letter), 'lampas' (lamp), 'machina' (machine), 'purpura' (purple) and many others tell their own tale, and live in modern languages (see also page 1756).

The marked affinities found in Latin to the Celtic group of languages, represented by Irish, Welsh, Gaelic and ancient Gaulish, as well as the geographical position of Gauls in northern Italy (Gallia Cisalpina), point to a Celto-Italic period, when the ancestors of both Gauls and of Italic tribes spoke a common language, before the invasion of the

peninsula. But apart from similarities due to prehistoric contact, Latin borrowed in historic times from Celtic sources such words as 'bascauda' (basket), four names for different sorts of vehicles, 'cisium,' 'essedae,' 'raeda,' 'petorritum' (four-wheeler: cf. Welsh 'pedwar'), and two terms for a horse, 'mannus' and 'caballus.'

Ancient Italic dialects fall broadly into two divisions, the first comprising Latin and Faliscan, the second Umbro-Sabellian, including Oscan. These are distinguished as 'q-' or 'p-' dialects according to their treatment of an original consonantal sound termed a guttural velar. Thus, Latin and Faliscan are 'q-' dialects; for we find the Latin 'quis' corresponding to the Oscan and Umbro-Volsian 'pis.' Neighbouring dialects, such as Oscan and Umbrian, contributed to the Latin vocabulary: words like 'rufus' (red) and 'scrofa' (a sow) are dialectic borrowings with an 'f' where genuine Latin would have 'b,' and a form like 'popina' (cook-shop) supplanted the true Latin 'coquina,' which has descended to us as 'kitchen.'

To aid the study of Latin sounds and usage within historic times over a long succession of centuries, we can draw evidence from literature, inscriptions, statements by grammarians, glossaries, and traces of spoken Latin. The periods of this history may be given as five, corresponding to divisions of the literature.

*Aids to the Study  
of Latin sounds*

The first is an archaic period (500-240 B.C.), interesting philologically but characterised by rather uncouth remains, largely of a legal and ritual kind. Quaint litanies descend from these early days, but it is difficult to determine how much their wording has been modernised or falsely archaised. With inscriptions we are on surer ground. What is commonly reckoned the oldest of these is that on a brooch (fifth century B.C., see page 1599) from Praeneste (Palestrina), in letters running from left to right, 'Mánios med fhéfhaked Númasioi,' corresponding to the classical Latin 'Manius me fecit Numerio' (Manius made me for Numerius). At this time the first syllable of each word bore the accent, which in Latin depended on stress, not pitch, as in Greek. Vowel-weakening

in non-accented syllables has not set in ; so 'fhéfhaked' has not yet become 'feféked,' a reduplicated form which preceded 'fecit.' 'Númasioi' has still to weaken its second vowel, change its intervocalic 's' to 'r,' alter its accent and drop its final vowel, before it takes the classical form 'Numério.'

The second period (240-70 B.C.) includes the earliest attempts at drama and epic on Greek lines. During it the literary language gradually drew away from the spoken form. Towards the end of the period the Social War in Italy meant extinction for many rustic dialects, except in so far as certain elements persisted in local varieties of Latin. Oscan, indeed, was spoken in Campanian towns in the first century of the Christian era ; and engravings in Oscan were found on house-walls at Pompeii. But Sulla's victory, as it prevented the new capital at Corfinium, which the revolted Italians named in Oscan 'Viteliu' (Italia), from rivalling Rome, also dispelled all hope of any Italic dialect competing with Latin.

No period in the development of the literary language showed such growth. Its early phases present the rude Saturnian

verse of Livius Andronicus and Naevius, the manifest working of popular speech and pronunciation in the comedies of Plautus, and the endeavours of Ennius to adapt Latin to his newly introduced hexameter line. When the period closes, about the time of Vergil's birth, we still detect signs of wrestling with a difficult medium in Lucretius, who, face to face with Greek thought, laments the 'poverty of the ancestral tongue.'

Yet mighty strides had been made: the language of verse had been prepared for the magic touch of Vergil, while prose, after undergoing the dull experiments of early chroniclers, had been used with increasing power by historians and lawyers, and particularly by three groups of orators—Cato, the cultured Scipio Aemilianus and his intimate Laelius ; then the Gracchi and their political opponents ; and later the Antonius and Crassus of the generation senior to Cicero. Greek lecturers in Rome directed attention to

literary criticism and to rhetorical principles ; and about the opening of the first century B.C. Aelius Stilo laid the foundations of Latin grammatical study. Prose was consequently ripe for its consummation in oratory by Cicero, whose famous speeches impeaching Verres, ex-governor of Sicily, belong to the year 70.

With the opening of the third period we are on the threshold of the 'Golden Age' (70 B.C.-A.D. 14), during which the Latin language attained its fullest glory in the verse of **Dawn of the Golden Age** Catullus, Vergil, Horace and the elegiac poets, and in the prose of Cicero, Caesar and Livy. The primitive intractability has gone ; instead we have a finished, sonorous, logical language fitted for giving ideal expression to the national aspirations of Rome. Without the Greek subtlety and variety, wealth of particles and prepositional constructions, without an equal faculty for building up compounds, Latin yet was capable of adaptation to highly artistic as well as to strictly serviceable purposes.

While it could convey a poet's passion and pathos or a historian's judgements, it could also serve, as no other language has ever done so well, the needs of legal enactment or lapidary inscription or stately ritual. Unrivalled as an instrument for lucid, forcible and dignified exposition of a case in law, a historical event, a moral theory, a useful art, a national mission, Latin was the very counterpart of the practical character of the Roman people. Rough-hewn though it looks in its archaic monuments, it is gradually shaped by both prose writers and poets to beautiful ends. The heavy thumps and thuds of some of Ennius's lines are scarcely recognizable as the language of the graceful poetry in Vergil's Eclogues, where there is an easy movement with free overflow from one line into another. The once cumbrous language developed a marvellous agility in Catullus's lyrics or Ovid's elegiacs or, later, in Martial's epigrams.

In prose, Cato's vigorous hammer-strokes driving home an instruction are far surpassed in art by the full, melodious, pleading cadence of Cicero's sentences, in which structure and rhythm were so

elaborately studied that abstract ideas and intricate clause-connexion might be combined with a musical lucidity. One of Cicero's favourite rhythms for sentence-endings ('*essē vidētūr*') was noted by Quintilian and other ancients as almost a mannerism. A brief quotation from the speech for Archias will show its effective contrast to the slower movement of the preceding clause:

*Saxa et solitudines voci respondent, bestiae saepe immanes cantu flectuntur atque cōstātūt: nos instituti rebus optimis non poctarum vōcē mōvēāmūr?*

'Crags and deserts echo the human voice, often huge brute-beasts are swayed by music and they stand stock-still: are we who have enjoyed the noblest of trainings not to be touched by the accents of a poet?'

To reproduce, as far as is feasible, the pronunciation of Latin at this time, it should be observed that the main accent of a word did not now

stand higher than the antepenultimate syllable, and stood there only when the penultimate was short—(e.g. '*tempestātibus*,' but '*tempestāte*'). The vowel sounds may be imitated by adopting those in Italian; of the consonants, 'c' and 'g' were uniformly hard.

Aristocratic though Latin may be called beyond other literatures, the period was not without traces of the common speech; but for the moment the fortunes of literary Latin may be followed.

The high cultivation and urbane conventionality of the book language contained seeds of decay during the fourth period (A.D. 14–180), the 'Silver Age' of the early Empire. Most of the writers, but not all, betray an excess of artificiality due to the rhetorical education which fostered epigrammatic point in every kind of composition and a poetic colouring for prose style. There were fluctuations of taste which affected prose especially. Though, under Nero, Seneca reached the acme of terseness in his clever sentences, Quintilian, the most eminent professor of the next generation, advocated a return to the Ciceronian model of the rounded period. Later, in the middle of the second century, Fronto and Gellius, avowedly archaistic in their preference for the obsolete, harked back to early Latin

writers, while Apuleius, like Fronto from Africa, shows unmistakable signs of the influence of spoken Latin.

With Apuleius we reach the opening of the final stage—the period of Late Latin from about A.D. 180 to the break-up of spoken Latin into the Romance languages. About the end of the second century the enlistment of Latin in the service of Christian apologetics by Minucius Felix and Tertullian (see Chap. 87) had lasting consequences. It meant that a language adapted to abstract expression, though in different ways, by Cicero and Seneca in their philosophical works, was destined in the future to be, however altered, the language of a great Church, handed down through the Fathers and the Vulgate to the Middle Ages. Here in part lay the secret of its historical universality.

As, during this period, spoken Latin not only contributed to the debasement of written style, but was a determining factor in producing the Romance languages, it is necessary to consider it briefly. The cultured diction of literature and the speech of the common folk ('*sermo plebeius*') were equally descended from ancient Latin—the parting had come with the creation of a partly exotic literature under Greek auspices. The two manners—the literary and the ordinary—continued to diverge, but also to influence each other; for, as cultured expressions filtered down into vulgar speech, introducing a measure of refinement, so plebeian and even servile expressions passed up into literature, bringing an added smack of reality.

If one distinguishes a '*sermo cotidianus*' or '*sermo urbanus*,' the every-day conversational Latin of the educated, from the more off-hand '*sermo plebeius*' and the still less polished country speech, '*sermo rusticus*,' one must beware of misconceiving these grades of the same language as separate entities. The severance never was absolute, and their mutual interplay would have been obvious to us, had some of the comedies of Roman work-a-day life survived. As it is, colloquial Latin appears in the more hastily written of Cicero's letters, and in some of the military continuators of Caesar. Plebeian phrases jostle erudite

Cultured diction and  
the vulgar tongue

terms in the encyclopedic Varro; and Catullus rings all the truer for his occasional slang, conversational idioms and coaxing diminutives.

That the satirists should at times copy the vigour of popular speech was to be expected, and may be exemplified from Lucilius, Horace, Persius, Juvenal and, in varying degrees of rudeness, from much of Petronius's *Satyricon*. Some of its characteristics were a liking for long words, careless employment of prefixes and suffixes, and piling up of frequentatives and diminutives.

Italic dialects had through the tongues of peasants exerted appreciable influence on the formation of the general Latin ultimately diffused throughout Italy; some Italic vocalisms, in fact, triumphed over Latin and are perpetuated in Romance languages of to-day. As vulgar Latin was carried first over Italy and then over the Roman world, it underwent modifications owing to contact with various native peoples. Spanish Latin was different from Gallic Latin and both were different from African. The emperor Septimius Severus kept an African accent till the end of his days, while his sister spoke what could scarcely be called Latin at all. So long as the Empire held together, the influence of literary and official Latin, by imposing a normal standard, kept such local peculiarities in check; but with the dissolution of the Empire came the dissolution of Latin into separate Romance languages.

Important factors in the transformation were loss or corruption of inflexional endings, introduction of auxiliary verbs, and use of articles, definite and indefinite. The

**Emergence of the Romance languages** and indefinite. The Romance languages vocabulary was drawn mainly from the stock of words in common use; it was 'caballus,' not 'equus,' for example, and 'focus,' not 'ignis,' that determined the words for 'horse' and 'fire' in Italian, Spanish and French. Combined with the late Latin vocabulary went a free adoption of non-Latin words.

In English, which is fundamentally Teutonic, a great part of the vocabulary has come from Latin at different periods. The Roman occupation of Britain has left its mark on place-names like Chester,

(from 'castra'); Stratford (from 'stratum'); Lincoln (from 'colonia'). During the centuries following the introduction of Christianity into Britain, words, many of them ecclesiastical like 'altar,' 'cowl,' 'temple,' found their way into Saxon English. With the Norman Conquest came a huge accession of words, ultimately from Latin. These were especially words pertaining to feudalism, law and the chase, such as 'chivalry,' 'homage,' 'tenant,' 'estate,' 'larceny,' 'forest,' 'venison.' The Revival of Learning in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries accounted for copious borrowings by English writers from Latin direct, like 'accelerate,' 'alacrity,' 'biped,' 'circumference.' In addition, though English has borrowed much from Greek directly, Latin, as the language of the Church, was the medium through which many Greek words have been transmitted, as 'alms,' 'bishop,' 'church,' 'hymn,' 'martyr,' 'psalm.'

About the ninth century Latin ceased to be in the strict sense spoken. This does not imply that it died; for its influence remained alive and deservedly far-reaching. **Restricted use of spoken Latin** It continued to be the language of medieval scholars, theologians, philosophers and statesmen; and the ceremonials of the Roman Church maintained its use. Through Latin translations, during the centuries which had in western Europe become Greekless, medieval students read their Aristotle. Then with the Renaissance came a revival not only of Greek but of Latin learning; and much excellent Latin prose and verse was written under the inspiration of the best classical models.

We turn now to the literature which this language subserved. The modern observer is accustomed to think of the Romans as an able people skilled in government, war and law, in the making of roads, bridges and aqueducts, to whose practical genius Europe owes the basis of its civilization. But the finest monument of the Romans—a noble and varied literature—testifies equally to their practical sense; for from first to last it runs parallel to the life of the community, usually reflecting and satisfying social needs and aspirations. The literature is

a mirror of the intense life of Rome—of her triumphant efforts for supremacy over all Italy and then over the lands around the Mediterranean; and, because there is this constant historical background, the literature is a supremely national one, whether under the old senatorial Republic or under the imperial system.

It remains national, too, in spite of the profound debt to Greek models, and thereby bears testimony to one of the most practical traits in the Roman character—

the gift of assimilation

**National quality of** in the province of  
**Latin literature** ideas; religion and art.

Although, owing to force of circumstances, much of Latin literature was the creation of the few for the few, and was an artistic creation all the more select because of its learned dependence upon Greek, yet the body of the people did not fail to exert influence upon cultured circles, and the best works spoke for the whole community.

Response to some social need is characteristic of the earliest forms of native Latin literature long before the operation of Greek literary influence. Bantering farces like the Fescennine and the Atellan contributed to the holiday amusement of rustic merry-makers; and the medley which bore the famous name of 'satura' (satire) was, if Livy is right, also at first a piece of rude mummery. Vintage and harvest festivals fostered the dramatic impulse traceable in the later literature, and with it a realistic gift, a satiric jocularly, an aptitude for repartee.

Religion taught the first rhythmic prayers around the sacrificial altar to the accompaniment of music and a ritual dance; so that among the most archaic remains of religious poetry are the barely intelligible litanies chanted by the Salian priests and the Arval brethren. Banquets used to give occasion for reciting poems about heroes, and those lays of ancient Rome may have transmitted certain historical and epic elements, though not to the extent which Niebuhr maintained. They were presumably in the primitive Saturnian, which, like Anglo-Saxon and modern verse, was accentual; not, like Greek and Latin classical verse, quantitative. The books of the priests were not

merely religious archives; their further concern with the calendar involved a record of past years, distinguished by the names of consuls and notable events, so that the elements of annalistic history were already discernible. The Twelve Tables of the law (see page 1648), learned by rote at school, inculcated a primitive precision of formula, which, however, fell far short of artistic prose.

The comparative poverty of these early productions was realized by Livius Andronicus, a highly educated Greek ex-slave from Tarentum, who taught in Rome during the later part of the third century B.C. As no literary texts for school use existed in Latin, he decided to make one, and therefore translated the Odyssey of Homer into Saturnian verse. Only a few scraps survive; but, as Horace had the work for class-lessons in the middle of the first century, it is not too much to say that Andronicus remained the schoolmaster of young Romans for many generations. A play which he based on a Greek original and put on the stage in 240 B.C. is taken to mark the start of Latin literature under Hellenic influence.

The date is significant. A literary outburst immediately followed the close (in 241 B.C.) of the first of three titanic contests against Carthage, when, after twenty-four years of warfare, Rome gained her first province of Sicily, with its rich Greek cities. Within little more than two hundred years Rome held in her power Spain, Gaul, Macedonia, North Africa, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt. To this period of conquest abroad and startling political change at home most of the greatest Latin literature belongs, exhibiting the stimulus of circumstance in such varying moods of the writers as exaltation, depression, passion or thankfulness.

Naevius, a Campanian, was a sympathiser with the common folk in their struggle against the nobility, who punished him for his satiric outspokenness. National in choice of subject for his epic—the first Punic War—he was also national in keeping the old Saturnian metre. His poem seems to contain the first appearance in Latin of legends (perhaps derived from

Sicily) connecting Rome with Troy, and relating the love of Dido for Aeneas.

Already in his epithets we see the beginnings of the artistic diction which gave to poetry a quality absent from the common speech. He composed plays, both light and serious, for the games of the day. His tragedies he based on Greek mythological models, but he could be original in drama as he was in epic; for he introduced historical plays (*Romulus* and *Remus*, *The Taking of Clastidium*) where Roman characters appeared in official robes, 'praetextae,' by which title such plays came to be known. It is curious that the national spirit of nobles and people did not sufficiently foster this native type of drama; we know only a dozen titles throughout Latin literature.

Ennius, a southerner, claimed 'three hearts' corresponding to his three languages, Greek, Oscan and Latin. From Greek he introduced the hexameter, the traditional line of epic from Homer onward; but from Rome he drew the inspiration of a great subject. He related in his eighteen books the pageant of Roman success through the centuries down to the last two generations of warfare against Carthage: he rendered in artistic form the popular feeling of exaltation. Of the epic about six hundred lines survive, among which the traces of speeches suggest a strong dramatic quality. Ennius was, in



FATHER OF ROMAN POETRY

'Our greatest poet' in Cicero's opinion and 'a second Homer' in Horace's, Quintus Ennius (239-169 B.C.) introduced the hexameter and the Homeric treatment into Latin poetry. Ennius was buried in the tomb of the Scipios (page 1646) and this bust was included among theirs.

*Vatican Museums*

fact, a playwright; and quotations exist from twenty-two tragedies, two comedies and a historical drama by him.

In this first period of its youth Roman drama flourished as it never flourished again; it is, therefore, unfortunate that its tragic plays are now represented only



ANIMATED SCENE FROM A ROMAN COMEDY

This bas-relief on a lamp probably illustrates the mock marriage scene from the *Casina* of Plautus. On the right comes the wedding procession—a woman, a Silenus carrying a Cupid, and in the rear the bride carried by a man in order that she may be lifted over the threshold. A Cupid waits at the top of the steps to receive the bride, and on the left stands the bridegroom with his mule, in preparation for his departure into the country.

*British Museum*



TERENCE: A MASTER OF COMEDY

Publius Terentius Afer (c. 190-159 B.C.) was a master of pure Latinity. His comedies, notable for skilful construction, psychological insight and wide human interest, served as models for the playwright on the revival of the drama.

Capitoline Museum; photo, Anderson

in lists of titles and in collections of fragments. For a time there was equal zest on the part of playwrights and players, until those coarser amusements (pantomimes and games) of which Terence complains (page 1829) emptied the theatre. Roman tragedy based on Greek was cultivated by Ennius's nephew Pacuvius, and reached its zenith in the lost dramas of Accius. Their successors under the Empire need not detain us. In Augustan times Varius and Ovid wrote each a mythological tragedy now lost; and we have nine frigid examples by Seneca from Nero's reign. Seneca's were literary exercises rather than acting plays.

Under the Empire, indeed, the theatre, while it gave exhibitions of pantomime and 'fabulae salticae' (dramas acted by dancers), was eclipsed by the gladiatorial arena. Audiences which tolerated the crude realism of an actual crucifixion on the stage were unlikely to favour high dramatic art.

Meanwhile, lighter drama had for long been represented by the 'fabula palliata,' or comedy of Greek life, which Plautus, Terence, Caecilius, Trabea, Atilius, Turpilius and others composed, and by the

'fabula togata,' or comedy of Italian life, of which we have, unluckily, mere scraps by Titinius, Afranius and Atta. The ancient Oscan Atellan farce was for a time transformed to literature by Pomponius and Novius, but ousted by the bustling and often indecent mime, to which, however, Laberius and Publilius Syrus gave a better tone in Caesar's day. The two outstanding names are those of Plautus, who established comedy, and Terence, who refined it. By the former we possess twenty plays, almost all complete; by the latter, six.

Plautus, a plebeian from Umbria, who had tried his hand at various humble trades, was not so much a literary scholar as an expert in stagecraft, whose patrons were the public of the day. In other words, he made his appeal to an audience which was not yet the demoralised crowd of later times, but in the main a free Italian stock living by its labour—artisans, traders, farmers, burghers who had, many of them, fought for Rome and felt their horizons widened in Sicily or Spain or North Africa. He belonged to and wrote for such a population, and his comedies, though adapted from Greek originals, were manifestly nearer to everyday life than the ideal sorrow of tragedy or the ideal heroism of epic could be.

His plays, therefore, throw light on Roman manners about the end of the third century B.C.; for the author had met strange fellows in his rough and tumble career. From experience came his knack of inventing funny situations and telling dialogue. His subjects and, to a great extent, his characters, like the scapegrace son, penurious father, clever slave, smart courtesan or needy parasite, were found for him in the Greek comedy of manners best represented by Menander. But his boisterous humour revels in adding chicaneries of all sorts, capers, drunkenness and buffettings: he is a master of comic 'business,' with a wealth of puns and parodies, and words freely borrowed or freely invented. (For Plautus see also under Chapter 61.)

Terence's comedies, dramatising the same social world, have, when compared with Plautus, greater psychological in-

Racy comedies  
of Plautus

terest; they are studies in character and sentiment. Their author, once an African slave, had been made at home in the aristocratic circle of Scipio the Younger, and imbibed its culture and outlook. More polished, though less realistic, than the Plautine plays, they sometimes seem not so much specially Greek or specially Roman as simply human. The saying of one of his characters in *The Self-Tormentor* would yield an appropriate motto for him: 'I am man; nothing that touches man do I count foreign to me.'

Younger by some ten years than Terence, and in touch with the same cultivated circle, Lucilius was a figure of vast importance for the development of that most intensely Roman of all literary forms—satire. Having before him the example




#### THE OLD RETAINER

A favourite stock figure in Roman comedy was a trusted elderly slave aghast at, even if abetting, his young master's misbehaviour. He is amusingly represented in this statuette.

*British Museum*

of Ennius and Pacuvius in some kind of moralising satire, this knight of independent means from Campania set himself to limn social features in scathingly critical verses. His discursive genius reflected with irony the unrest of the generation which preceded the first century B.C., and his very fragments show his value as an index to contemporary life. He experimented with various forms, but finally concentrated on the hexameter, which thereafter became the typical verse for satire, as used by Horace, Persius and Juvenal.

Prose meanwhile had also advanced in the provinces of history, law and oratory, as noted in reviewing the language. So strong was Greek example that the first histories by Romans were written in Greek;



#### WHERE ROMANS WATCHED THE DRAMATIC WORKS OF NATIVE PLAYWRIGHTS

In the year 55 B.C. Pompey was granted permission to erect near the Campus Martius the first Roman theatre of stone; it had seating accommodation for 40,000 people. Extensive ruins of the building are still in existence, warranting this reconstruction, which illustrates the elaborate architecture lavished on the proscenium of Roman theatres. Behind the theatre was a spacious portico with a public park where members of the audience could stroll during intervals.

*Reconstruction by L'Évêque, based on Ballard, from Rossetti, 'Rome,' Clarendon Press*



but Latin was used by Calpurnius Piso, Antipater, Quadrigarius, Valerius of Antium and Sisenna. Cato the Censor, a powerful orator, had in vain tried to stem the tide of Hellenic refinement. Not without Greek culture himself, Cato distrusted its value for Rome. His one surviving work, *De Agricultura*, was modelled on the Greek translation of an agricultural treatise by the Carthaginian Hanno. To instruct his fellow-citizens in their past he wrote his *De Originibus*. The rival new spirit was, however, evident in the Scipionic literary circle which, combining Hellenic taste with Roman tradition, welcomed not only Greeks like the historian Polybius and the Stoic philosopher Panaetius, but also the two best Latin poets of the times, Terence and Lucilius.

The last century of the Republic was one of deadly turmoil (see Chaps. 62–64). Into these troublous times were born

most of the greatest  
**Greatest figures in** figures in Latin litera-  
**Latin literature** ture—Cicero (106 B.C.),  
Caesar (102 or 100),  
Lucretius (99), Sallust (86), Catullus (84),  
Vergil (70), Horace (65), Livy (59), Propertius (50), Ovid (43). Of these names the first five represent the Ciceronian and the second five the Augustan period, and these two periods together constitute by universal agreement the 'Golden Age,' because to it belong the best poetry, the best oratory, and, except for Tacitus, the best history written in Latin. Its masterpieces have held posterity through their classic possession of a beauty that constitutes a permanent touchstone of taste. The modern reader still responds to the immortal appeal of their humanity, and finds in them solace and amusement.

Lucretius reflects an era of disillusion. Profoundly distressed over the tribulations of the time, horrified at the appalling ruin wrought by greed, ambition and other passions, he longed to teach his fellow Romans a serenity of mind. It is in the lore of Epicurus (see also Chaps. 47 and 67), he fervently believes, that true peace may be found; to read the riddle of the universe is to cease from vain fretfulness, vain desires, vain beliefs.

In six books of hexameter verse On The Nature of Things (*De Rerum Natura*)

he writes like a devout neophyte converted in full sincerity to the Epicurean doctrine that pleasure is the guide of life; and upon the atomic theory of the origin of all things which Epicurus took over from Democritus he bases a creed to rule the soul. There are interesting anticipations of modern theories on the origin of species, the evolution of civilization, and the germ theory of disease. This materialist and rationalist poem, which logically subverted all religion, preached in its disturbing way a new tranquillity and a new emancipation from all gross superstitions. Alongside of his science and philosophy worked an overmastering feeling for beauty, so that, while there are dull and prosaic tracts of reasoning, there are flights into majestic poetry. Only a true poet could have written the quite illogical preliminary invocation to Venus.

A different Greek influence—Alexandrinism—acted on Catullus and his group of youthful fellow-poets, including Calvus (an able speaker as well as poet) and Helvius Cinna. Well acquainted with Alexandrian technique in occasional poetry and with the learned, sentimental, often erotic colour of late Greek authors like Callimachus, they yet found much material in the life around them. Their loves and hates were Roman. All this is true of Catullus from

Verona. Alexandrinism  
colours his longer poems  
—his *Epithalamia*,  
Attis, Berenice's Hair, and his miniature epic on Peleus and Thetis. But he lived in the present as well; so he could lampoon Caesar with bitter mockery, lament his brother with the tender accents of everlasting farewell ('Atque in perpetuum frater ave atque vale'—For ever, brother, greeting and farewell), and pour out, with a human passion that all the centuries can understand, the full chronicle of his heart's devotion to 'Lesbia,' sister of Cicero's arch-enemy Clodius, through every phase of an ill-starred amour—from infatuation to doubt, distrust and final disenchantment.

I hate, yet love: you ask how this may be.  
Who knows? I feel its truth and agony.

While Catullus represented a romantic type of learning, Terentius Varro of Reate

represented miscellaneous learning. Antiquary, grammarian, jurist, agriculturist, he produced with amazing energy through a long life hundreds of volumes—among them a hundred and fifty books of Menippean satires ranging in a medley of prose and verse over a wide field of social, ethical and literary topics. His pride in the past of Rome gave to his labours a more national note than is found in Greek scholars, who were more dispassionate in their pursuit of human knowledge.

Less encyclopedic than Varro, but an admirer of his learning, M. Tullius Cicero of Arpinum (see illustration in page 1779), was himself an accomplished scholar, who left a permanent mark on public life as politician and orator.

Typical pre-Ciceronian speakers have already been mentioned as contributing to the advance of the language. Its theoretical treatment is well illustrated by the handbook *Ad Herennium*, possibly by Cicero the supreme master of Oratory. This field of theory was to

attract Cicero, when he devoted his leisure to producing a triad of works, the *De Oratore*, the *Brutus* and the *Orator*. But it was in his actual use of Latin as both speaker and writer that Cicero showed supreme mastery. A busy statesman and lawyer (see further, Chap. 64), he pronounced before Senate, juries or people innumerable orations, of which we possess between fifty and sixty; composed, in addition to rhetorical treatises, many works on philosophy and political science; and left behind him hundreds of letters which were collected and edited by his freedman Tiro. What poetry he wrote



CATO THE CENSOR

Marcus Porcius Cato (234-149 B.C.), memorable as the first Roman prose-writer of merit, wrote the first Roman history in the Latin tongue. His one surviving work is his treatise on agriculture.

*Laterna Museum, Rome*

did not add to his reputation.

The sensitive and emotional qualities which made him a telling orator led him easily from one mood to another: he could hush a law-court with the impressive solemnity of thoughts upon immortality, and in another case facetiously banter an opposing counsel on the absurd paradoxes of Stoicism. The same lips could, Italian-like, veer from delicate tenderness to venomous hatred, when the anarchist noble Catiline had to be attacked in the four *Catilinarian Orations* during the orator's consulship in 63, or when, twenty years later, Mark Antony had to be denounced in the *Philippics* as a dangerous supporter of the assassinated Julius Caesar.

The culmination of Cicero's career was his attainment of the consulship. His rescue of the state by the summary execution of the Catilinarian conspirators was used by his enemies to force him into exile in 58. Twice after his recall, first in 55 B.C., and again between 46 and 44, bitter disappointment with public events drove him into a retirement which bore fruit in learned treatises. In particular, to the second of those periods we owe the philosophical works in which he made Greek speculative thought available for Roman readers, and formulated an abstract vocabulary which had the most profound influence upon Christian apologists and medieval schoolmen, and indeed on the whole of later philosophical language.

If one is apt in Cicero's case to dwell more on his writings than on his public activities, the reverse holds good of Julius Caesar. His indelible mark as statesman and soldier upon the world



GAIUS SALLUSTIUS CRISPUS

Sallust (86–35 B.C.) was the first Roman who aimed at writing philosophical history, and was an admirable delineator of character. His Jugurthine War is picturesque, his Catiline one of the best historical monographs in Latin.

*Leningrad Museum*

of action is apt to make one forget his oratory, scholarship and literary versatility; yet he was a polished speaker and wrote works, even verses, on subjects entirely unrepresented in his extant seven books *On the War in Gaul*, and the three *On the Civil War*. The former work virtually consists of dispatches, which, though in appearance coldly dispassionate, yet constitute an apology, as adroit as it is covert, for the commander-in-chief's Gallic administration; while the latter, dignified in its restraint, chronicles the author's quarrel with the Senate on the question of his command in 49, and his subsequent fighting against the nobility led by Pompey. This unadorned and unemotional Caesarian prose affords a marked contrast to the Ciceronian.

The continuators of Caesar in the eighth book *On the War in Gaul*, and in the narratives of the Alexandrian, African and Spanish campaigns, vary in literary ability, but are all eclipsed in style by Sallust, two of whose historical works, *Catiline's Conspiracy* and *The War Against Jugurtha*, have survived. Sallust freed history from a rigid annalistic treatment, and through

the terse vigour of a distinctive style exercised a deep influence upon writers in the Silver Age. His moral digressions may strike an unreal note, but he had the gift of conveying atmosphere, as is best felt in his descriptions of North African landscape. Far less genius was displayed by Cornelius Nepos, who composed *Lives of celebrities*, mostly Greek. It is unfortunate that so few of his Roman biographies have come down.

We realize that we have reached the second phase of the Golden Age, its Augustan period, when we read Vergil's pastoral praises of the young Octavian as a divine giver of peace to a blood-drenched world. The *Eclogues* or *Bucolics* of Vergil (P. Vergilius Maro) are ten pastoral poems written during a few years following 43 B.C. Vergil was born in 70 in the north near Mantua, and had spent at Rome years on study and poetic experiment as one of a circle of young poets, which included the talented but ill-fated Gallus. It is disputed how far they are individually or collectively responsible for the poems ascribed to Vergil's youth—*Culex*, *Ciris* and shorter pieces.

The works on which his fame rests are three. The earliest, the *Eclogues*, show the hand of Gallus still discernible here and there. They celebrate mainly the loves and singing contests of an ideal shepherd life, in which the author's North Vergil, laureate of Italian memories are charmingly blended with idyllic imitations of the Sicilian Theocritus. Next came the *Georgics*, four polished books concerning crops, trees, cattle and bees, suggested by the Greek poet Hesiod's *Works and Days*, but also echoing Roman poets like Lucretius, whose speculations on the universe powerfully affected Vergil in early days. The Vergilian didacticism—and it is daring to think of making agricultural processes and farm implements poetic—is wedded in an astonishing degree to a sense of beauty inspired by a love of Italy as a land to be cherished by true patriots. Here the poet's endeavour is to support the policy of Octavian in favour of a revival of country life. His idealistic patriotism finds expression in such passages as:

Hail to thee, land of Saturn! Mighty mother of fruits, mighty mother of men! For thee I essay themes of olden fame and skill, adventuring to open hallowed well-springs, and chant the lay of Ascrea [Hesiod's] through Roman towns.

His last eleven years, largely spent at Naples, Vergil gave to composing the twelve books, never finished to his satisfaction, of the *Aeneid*, the story of Aeneas, the legendary Trojan progenitor of the Italian house to which the Caesars belonged. An epic of voyaging and warfare, it owed much to the Homeric *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, but the author's deep scholarship laid Greek and Latin literature widely under contribution. Learning, artistry, symbolism, mysticism, pathos, are among the qualities which make this national epic a great poem. The Trojan exile's hard-won attainment of a divinely appointed home in Italy mirrors the spirit of Vergil's own age in its consciousness of peace secured after prolonged civil strife and of responsibility taught in a school of hardship. Thus, while the Vergilian melancholy reflects that 'tears haunt the world;

man's fortunes touch the heart,' yet there rings out in unison a brave note of optimism: 'Ye that have suffered heavier woes, to these also will God set an end.' Nothing gives more dynamic force to the epic than this blend of confidence with the sad music of humanity.

Vergil stood at the close of a great era, but also at the dawn of a greater. He is full of both history and prophecy. The true Roman self-mastery and self-devotion learned in the past must, he sees, continue through a mightier career of work for the control, the union and the civilization of the peoples on earth:

Roman, take heed, with empire  
rule the world!

These be thine arts—to set the  
law of peace,  
To spare the vanquished, and to  
quell the proud.

Vergil's friend Horace (Q. Horatius Flaccus), who was

slightly junior to him, came from Southern Italy. In his series of works, the *Epodes* (light and satiric verses mainly in iambic measures), the *Satires* (in hexameters), the *Odes* (in varying lyric metres), and the *Epistles* (in hexameters), he bequeathed a literary legacy whose varied human interest has captured the affection of readers in all countries and at all times. His *Satires*, though under obligations to Lucilius, are more genial than his were in their attitude towards the foibles of mankind; their craftsmanship is of an infinitely higher order.

The *Odes*, of which the first three books appeared in 23 B.C., are, many of them, poems of friendship, love, conviviality, persiflage, reflection, some purely occasional though finished in form, and others again serious homilies on the virtues that exalt a nation. As a 'priest of the muses,' Horace claimed a right to chant a message of his own to the younger generation ('*virginibus puerisque canto*'); and no finer testimony could be borne to the wise imperial statesmanship of Augustus than the



#### GREATEST GLORY OF ROMAN POETRY

In this mosaic from a Roman villa at Carthage Vergil is depicted seated with the manuscript of the *Aeneid* on his knee, with Clio reading to him from a roll and Melpomene, tragic mask in hand, leaning on his chair. The beauty and the national character of Vergil's poetry early made him the object of a cult.

*Bardo Museum, Tunis; from Monumenta Piot*

confidence shown in it by the poetic advocacy of one who had in youth been strongly anti-Caesarian. A mellowing of thought from an easy-going Epicureanism into a moderate Stoicism is traceable in his works.

The Epistles touch not only upon the philosophy of life, but also upon literary criticism. Indeed, the famous *Art of Poetry*, influential as a manual of criticism in French and English literature, is strictly an epistle addressed to the poet's friends the Pisones. That shrewd but kindly observation of life which yielded Horace much of his material and prompted his indulgent judgements is the secret of his appeal. It was one of his habits to take an evening stroll in the forum to watch the cheap-jacks and fortune-tellers at work upon the gullibility of the crowd. He may be said

to preach a reasoned temperance, a golden mean of enjoyment, a 'gathering of the rose-buds while one may' ('*carpe diem*'), and a brave acceptance of fate.


The three chief elegiac poets of the time were Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid; they perfected the single Greek verse-form—alternate hexameter and pentameter—hitherto undeveloped in Latin. All of them wrote of love, but not of love alone. Tibullus to his plaints over his luckless affection for 'Delia' and 'Nemesis' added a genuine taste for the country and its customs. Propertius, equally unblest in his passion for 'Cynthia,' has less sweetness but more vigour than Tibullus. His mythological

learning sometimes becomes pedantry and contributes to his obscurity.

Ovid was far more than an elegiac poet, and, as a prince of story-tellers, has



'PRIEST OF THE MUSES'  
Satirist, lyricist, moralist and critic, Quintus Horatius Flaccus wrote the most polished odes of the Augustan age and raised for himself a monument more durable than brass.  
*From Bernoulli's 'Röm. Ikonographie'*



BACCHUS HONOURING A TRAGIC POET WITH A VISIT

Sculptors of the Augustan age produced some notable pictorial reliefs in marble. This example represents a visit from Bacchus to a tragic poet reclining in the open air outside his house; a table with cakes and wine stands beside the couch, with a row of tragic masks beneath it. The corpulent, bearded god stands supported by a young Satyr, while a second Satyr draws his sandals off his feet; Silenus and a train of Satyrs are following the god.

*British Museum*


remained a fertile influence upon painting and letters. From boyhood he 'lisp'd in numbers,' and the gift of facile expression in verse made legal studies uninteresting. His love-poetry includes *Amores*, *Heroides* (imaginary correspondence of legendary heroines) and the *Art of Love*, whose wantonness earned Augustus's decree of expulsion from Rome to the Black Sea. Before his banishment from the capital he had written eighteen hexameter books of *Metamorphoses*, or mythological transformations, and his incomplete *Fasti* or calendar of legends. His *Tristia* ring incessant changes upon the misery of a home-sick exile. Grattius's *Cynegetica* on hunting-dogs and Manilius's *Astronomica* continue the didactic tradition.

In Augustan prose the outstanding figure was Livy, who conceived the gigantic task of relating in a hundred and forty-two books the pageant of Roman history from the mistiest beginnings down to his own age. Of the first forty-five books the second decade is lost, and nothing later than Book Forty-five has survived except summaries for nearly all the books, which indicate his scale of treatment. The alleged 'Patavinity,' or smack of his native Padua, in his style may lie in little more than that wealth of diction which befits his theme. The loss of the volumes on the civil war, in which he showed Pompeian sympathies is particularly to be deplored.

Several causes co-operated to create a distinctive Latin in the Silver Age:

changes in grammar and vocabulary inevitable in all language were accompanied by changes in

manner due especially to rhetorical education and the custom whereby authors gave 'recitationes' (readings) from their works before select audiences. Everything tended to discourage simplicity of expression and foster display. Virtue lay in devices calculated to produce effect.



READING-ROOM OF THE LIBRARY AT EPHESUS

The first large Roman library was founded by Asinius Pollio in 39 B.C., and in imperial times many were established in the capital and the provinces. All were built on the same general plan: a large reading-room set round with presses for the manuscripts, and subsidiary smaller rooms.

Reconstruction by Niemann

Nowhere can this style be better seen in the making than in the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* collected by the elder Seneca, whose marvellous memory enabled him to record the ingenious but far-fetched arguments of different professors in debating exercises upon supposed cases of murder, outrage, disinheritation, and so forth. It is when we turn to literature—to Lucan or Statius—that we find this academic cleverness applied with a dexterous command over every possible artifice.

If, however, the Silver Age is characterised by mannerism and conventionality, it is adorned by writers possessing a perennial human interest. We may not be brought near actual life in the epic themes of Lucan, Valerius or Statius, but Statius himself in his miscellaneous poems can, even under an artificial guise, put us in touch with the concrete reality of Italian scenery, mansions, baths and statues. Few eras of the past are so vividly re-created as that from which we inherit Petronius's *Satyricon* or novel of adventure (in part), Martial's epigrams, Pliny's letters, Juvenal's satires, Tacitus's historical writings and Suetonius's *Lives of the Caesars*.



#### WAITING FOR INSPIRATION

This pleasing fresco from Pompeii shows a handsome girl—Sappho, perhaps, or some young Pompeian poetess—with her polyptych, or wooden tablets, in her left hand and her stylus in her right, meditatively engaged in composition.

*National Museum, Naples; photo, Anderson*

In poetry the first notable work of the period was that of the Thracian ex-slave Phaedrus, who began in Tiberius's reign his series of beast-fables adapted from the Greek collection which bore the name of Aesop. In Latin iambs, these stories, comparatively free from artifice, sometimes seemed to have a satiric bearing: for misbehaving men recognized themselves in misbehaving animals, and legal proceedings were taken against the writer. The *Aratea* (a translation of the *Phainomena* of Aratus, by the prince Germanicus) was one of the learned adaptations of the day, and somewhat later Calpurnius Siculus handed on the Vergilian tradition in pastorals to Nemesianus in the third century. Nine plays, pale imitations of Greek tragedy, were written by Seneca the philosopher, partly as literary experiments, partly, it may be, to interest his pupil Nero. Not fitted for the stage, they yet exercised much influence on European drama; for example, the ghost and nurse in Elizabethan plays are descendants of Senecan characters.

The qualities of 'Silver' poetry are unmistakably evident in the *Pharsalia* of Seneca's precocious nephew, Lucan. The perilous friendship of Nero had turned to a mad jealousy, not likely to be ap-

peased by the young author's daring anti-Caesarism in ten epic books on Pompey's fight against Julius Caesar. Brilliant though cloying rhetoric, impassioned speeches, clever arguments, ingenious epigrams, strained conceits, elaborate descriptions, make up a work which Quintilian wisely commended to orators rather than to poets. One original feature in Lucan was his banishment of gods and goddesses from his historical narration.

The epic succession was continued by three poets, two of whom chose mythological themes, and one, like Lucan, a historical theme. Valerius Flaccus dedicated his *Argonautica* to Vespasian; Statius his *Thebaid* and incomplete *Achilleid* to Vespasian's second son, Domitian, in whose reign also Silius

Italicus issued part of his *Punica*. Valerius, perhaps the most poetic of this trio, is less successful in rising

Poets in the  
Epic succession

to the full opportunities of so romantic a tale as Jason's Quest of the Golden Fleece with his fellow-voyagers aboard the *Argo* than in awakening a psychological interest in the course of the love attachment between the hero and the princess Medea, who piquantly combines the qualities of uncanny enchantment with those of shy maidenliness. Here the Roman excels his Greek model, Apollonius of Rhodes.

Human interest is easier to find in Statius's five books of miscellaneous poems, the *Silvae*, than in his elaborate narrative of the legendary attack by the seven champions upon Thebes, where the style bears witness to his confessed admiration for Vergil. Still less human interest marks the seventeen books of Silius, in spite of his selection of a heroic figure in Hannibal at war with Rome. Here once more we meet the well-worn convention of intervening gods and goddesses.

Lucan's contemporary, Persius, left half a dozen satires scolding his generation as if he were a hot gospeller for Stoicism. A close student of Horace, he compressed or contorted many of his predecessors' expressions, and developed an extraordinarily crabbed style apt to obscure the real vigour of his onslaught upon human prejudices—'the old grandmothers' in the heart.

A couple of years after Persius's death, there arrived in Rome from Spain one with a very different outlook on the world. This was Martial. He did not long enjoy the protection of his fellow Spaniards Seneca and Lucan; for Piso's plot against Nero in 65 sealed their doom. But during more than thirty years in the capital his chief industry lay in the assiduous courting of patrons and the composition of brief occasional poems reflecting every type of society, high and low, rich and poor, honest and fraudulent, hardworking and idle, clean and unclean. We have nothing from him before his *Spectacles*, celebrating the games in the newly completed Colosseum in A.D. 80; but from 86 onwards for many years there appeared almost annually books of his *Epigrams* with that frequent suspension of the sting to the last line, or even last word, which is associated with his name. Though marred by flattery and coarseness, his style is in the main clear and free from rhetoric.


His friend Juvenal also held the mirror up to life; his sixteen satires in hexameters are, however, on a larger scale, and they are animated, not with easy-going indulgence, but, at least in the earlier books, with fiery wrath against the abuses, shams, vices and dangers of the overgrown cosmopolitan city. His motto is 'indignation makes verse.' The difficulty is to refrain from writing satire, and so with unsurpassable vehemence he launches his denunciations against successful villainy, fair-seeming hypocrites, mean hosts, unjust governors, foreign upstarts, objectionable women, grovelling dole hunters and the like. His declamatory method—in which he was a trained expert—plunges freely into exaggeration, but is not incompatible with sincerity of purpose; indeed vigour such as his, rather of the Lucilian than the Horatian type, could not rest upon artificiality.

A survey of 'Silver' prose takes one back to the compendious history of Velleius Paterculus, an officer once on service under Tiberius in his northern campaigns, who cannot sufficiently restrain his superlatives in praising his former commander. It was a merit in

Paterculus to find room for reflections on the emergence of literary genius at certain epochs. Memorable Deeds and Sayings, collected by Valerius Maximus, formed a useful repertory of anecdote for speakers or writers; but it suffers from rhetoric.

A little later, fine writing also crops out in Pomponius Mela's *Geography*, a study of countries following mainly a round of the Mediterranean sea-board. Q. Curtius took the conquests of Alexander the Great as material for a history which he made more romantic than scientific. In contrast with the prevalent affectation, Celsus, best known for his *De Medicina*, the sole surviving portion of an extensive encyclopedia, adopted a sensible type of businesslike prose. Nor was Columella's *Agriculture* weighed down with inappropriate decoration, though he allowed himself quotations from the *Georgics*, and for his tenth book accepted as a literary legacy from Vergil the hint that the subject of gardens should be treated in verse.

The writings of Seneca the younger, Lucan's uncle, are typical of the new prose. Born in Spain before the Christian era, he came early to Rome and was bred in rhetoric, his father being the compiler of the *Controversiae*. But his master-



SENECA THE YOUNGER

Lucius Annaeus Seneca (c. 4 B.C.—A.D. 65) was a distinguished exponent of the Stoic philosophy. Many of his essays have survived, and also nine tragedies which, though lacking in dramatic instinct, largely influenced 16th century drama.

Berlin Museum



passion was philosophy, which taught him as a youthful enthusiast an ascetic abstinence dangerous to his health. His clever speaking in the Senate imperilled his life under Caligula, and under Claudius in 41 court intrigue brought about a banishment to Corsica which lasted eight years. Recalled at the instigation of Nero's mother, Agrippina, he became tutor to the prince, and, after his accession, acted in conjunction with Burrus, as his adviser, until the tigerish qualities of a once promising ruler made mockery of such a work as Seneca's *On Clemency*. A surprisingly skittish lampoon from so staid a philosopher was the *Apocolocyntosis*, which in its Menippean mixture of prose and verse repaid an old grudge against the dead Claudius by picturing his contumelious rejection at the gates of heaven.

Seneca, however, won most fame by his series of works expounding neo-Stoic doctrine on questions such as Providence, Firmness, Tranquillity of Mind, The Happy Life. In handling such topics, in more extended treatises on Anger or Benefits, and in the *Moral Epistles*, he displayed a marvellous mastery over sparkling brevity of statement

and effective readiness. **Seneca as Stoic Philosopher** of illustration. Quintilian warns students against the seductive glitter of Seneca's essays; but there is far more in Seneca than the sententious compression which commended him to Montaigne and Bacon. A dignified earnestness pervades his insistence upon the divine principle inherent in the world and man, upon the sufficiency of goodness for happiness, upon the mind's subdual of passions or pain; there is, too, a fresh cosmopolitan note of brotherliness among men and humanity towards slaves.

Much less of a 'high-brow,' though an intensely clever *littérateur* capable of turning at will from one style to another, was Petronius, a consul, a provincial governor, and at Nero's court an arbiter whose word was law on matters of etiquette and taste. He wrote the first realistic and picaresque novel, the *Satyricon*, recounting the unsavoury escapades of two young scamps in various Italian towns. Considerable parts

of its fifteenth and sixteenth books are left, including 'Trimalchio's Banquet,' narrated with a keen eye to the vulgar parade and ludicrous ignorance of that self-satisfied upstart during the astoundingly lavish entertainment which he provides for a mixed company of guests. Their chatter is an excellent reproduction of off-hand expressions, slang and bad grammar, spoken by a low grade of society. The work contains a few well told short stories and episodes which show the author's power of treating literature and education critically and his skill in composing refined verse.

The portentous *Natural History* of the elder Pliny, in thirty-seven books, is the single extant monument to that indefatigable industry which enabled **The Elder Pliny's Natural History** him, amidst much honourable official duty, to save time for a mass of writings on historical, military and linguistic subjects. Antiquated now in its geography, physics, zoology, botany and mineralogy, his magnum opus retains importance as an index to the scientific knowledge of the time. It affords great enjoyment to anyone interested in quaintly readable descriptions of animals, or in old-world remedies—for medicine is very prominent. The digressions in the later books on art and artists give unique information concerning ancient painting and sculpture, and are infinitely more valuable than the author's intermittent indulgence in fine writing.

Pliny's contemporary, the eminent professor of rhetoric, Quintilian, has exercised an abiding influence as one of the world's great educators. A sagacious man with long experience in teaching, he devoted the evening of life to twelve books on *Institutes of Oratory*, ostensibly to train an accomplished speaker, but in reality to produce a cultured Roman gentleman fitted by character to use eloquence aright ('*vir bonus dicendi peritus*'—an upright man skilled in speaking). Quintilian's thoroughness in examining education from the nursery onwards, his breadth of view, his avoidance of undue entanglement in rhetorical technicalities and his critical pronouncements upon Greek and Latin authors serviceable for

students, make the work of permanent utility and interest.

One of Quintilian's pupils was the elder Pliny's nephew, who escaped death at eighteen during the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79, when he declined to accompany his uncle on his fatal scientific venture into the danger zone. Quintilian's lectures pointed the younger Pliny away from Seneca back to Cicero; but it is a considerably modified Ciceronianism that appears in his one surviving speech, the consular Panegyric

Charming letters of  
the Younger Pliny

on Trajan in A.D. 100. We possess ten books of Letters, of which nine, written, with an eye upon posterity, to a wide circle of correspondents, afford most interesting glimpses into social life, and obviously emanate from a scholar whose courtesy, generosity and naive vanity make an irresistible appeal to the reader.

His slightly senior friend Tacitus published nothing after his juvenile Dialogue on Orators until Domitian was safely dead, when historians could breathe freely. The monographs on his father-in-law, Agricola, governor of Britain, and on the tribes of Germany, mark the departure from his earlier Ciceronianism and foreshadow the developed compression, epigrammatic brilliance, and caustic judgements of the *Historiae* and *Annales*, or rather *Ab Excessu Divi Augusti* (After the Death of the Divine Augustus), works in which he set himself to relate first the events of A.D. 69-96 and then the preceding period A.D. 14-68. Biassed against most of the emperors, pessimistic in his view of the principate, over-enthusiastic for the republican past, and vague in describing military operations, Tacitus has many faults as a historian; but they are compensated by an extraordinarily individual style characterised by incisive psychological penetration into character and skilful command over vivid description.

This brilliance is absent from the matter-of-fact but well told Lives of the Caesars based by Suetonius upon imperial archives to which he had access as Hadrian's secretary. A spicy anecdote or a personal detail, such as the colour of the emperor's eyes or hair, were points essential to the author's biographic methods.

He wrote many Greek and Latin books, and from his Lives of Illustrious Men portions on grammarians, rhetoricians and poets have fortunately survived. The epitomiser Florus viewed Roman history as the growth of an organism from infancy through youth and maturity to decline, though he carefully postulates a revival under Trajan. It is not impossible that he may be the author of the *Pervigilium Veneris*, a springtide poem in trochaic tetrameters delightfully anticipating the romance of a later age with quatrain verses each closing with the haunting refrain:

Let the lover love to-morrow: let the loveless learn to love.

The reaction from Silver convention is manifest in the three representatives of an 'elocutio novella' (new manner of speaking). Fronto, an African rhetorician, in pursuit of fresh vigour, advocated a blend of an old-fashioned, pre-Ciceronian style



**SENECA'S TOMB BESIDE THE APPIAN WAY**  
After exercising much influence over Nero for many years Seneca incurred his dislike, and in A.D. 65 he was compelled to commit suicide in his villa on the Appian Way. This frieze is reputed to belong to his tomb on that famous road.

*Courtesy of Professor Halbherr*

with current speech. Similar enthusiasm for the antiquated possessed Gellius in compiling his quaint miscellany, *The Attic Nights*, while the movement culminated in Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*, a fantastic story, not without audacities in description, of his hero's transformation into an ass in Thessaly, the headquarters of sorcery. Its abnormal Latin cannot deprive of charm the incidental fairy-tale of Cupid and Psyche. Creative literature, however, did not thrive either under the tranquil government of the Antonines or amidst the anarchy of the third century; but law, scholarship and criticism found learned devotees, and epitomes were ominously preferred to the voluminous standards of the past. In fact, for some generations from the end of the second century the most virile thought expressed in Latin sprang from the new faith in Christ.

Octavius, a dialogue by Minucius Felix, argued out some aspects of Christianity, though with nothing like the fullness and fervour of Tertullian, who in his *Apologeticum* consecrated an eloquence learned in the law-

courts of Carthage to an unmeasured denunciation of pagan literature. Thenceforward, even if the break is not absolute, Christian Latinity is the concern of patristic rather than literary study, and is treated accordingly in Chapter 87. It suffices to note that Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, wrote a better style than Tertullian; and that Lactantius, though taught by Arnobius, the author of *Adversus Nationes*, did not imitate his instructor's lack of polish, but so steeped himself in classical rhetoric at Nicomedia that his *Divine Institutions* earned him the title of 'The Christian Cicero.'

The pagan Latin tradition had spasmodic revivals. After the outburst of the bizarre African Latinity in the second century came the turn of Gaul in the third, when the panegyrist took Pliny as their exemplar. Suetonius's biographic type of history was followed, more

feebly, by the six authors who, professedly if not actually under Diocletian and Constantine, composed a sequel in the *Historia Augusta*. It was left for Ammianus Marcellinus (330-405) to attempt a return, in strangely different style, to the Tacitean model in a continuation of Roman history from Nerva's reign.

Among poets there were signs of re-awakening. Vergilian influence had coloured Nemesianus's pastorals and his *Cynegetica* on hunting; while, in the fourth century, diverse classical traditions combined in the miscellaneous poems of Ausonius of Bordeaux with traits so modern that he might in some respects be considered the earliest poet of France. Claudian, an Alexandrian at the imperial court in Milan, is an excellent example of Rome's power to make the alien her own. For his historical epics he assimilated Vergil, for his Rape of Proserpine Ovid, and for his laudatory poems Statius. Either with him or with the Gaul, Rutilius Namatianus, who wrote when the empire was splitting up into new kingdoms, the national Roman poetry may be said to close.

But if there was no longer, after the fifth century, a Roman literature, Latin literature did not cease. Thenceforward it became European, as has been observed in tracing the fortunes of the language. Nothing more significantly links classical antiquity with the middle ages than to remember that Jerome's extraordinarily influential Vulgate version of the greater part of the scriptures appeared at the beginning of the fifth century, and that the sack of Rome by the Goths and Huns in 410 stirred Augustine in his *De Civitate Dei* (On the City of God) to make copious use of Latin literature for elaborating his conception of a heavenly city more abiding than the greatest of human empires. There is something inspiring in this age-long continuity of Latin, fertile in time-winnowed masterpieces to which the modern world still turns for their permanent human appeal.



LUCIUS APULEIUS

In the *Metamorphoses* adapted from a lost Greek romance by Lucius of Patrae—Apuleius preserved for posterity a unique specimen of the light literature of the ancient Greeks.

From Bernoulli

## PAGANISM &amp; THE PHILOSOPHIES

Codes of Conduct that took the Place of Religion  
among the Thinking Classes of the Empire

By the Very Rev. W. R. INGE D.D. C.V.O.

Dean of S. Paul's Cathedral, London; Author of *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, etc.

THE name religion, it has been said, comes to us from the least religious nation in the world, the Romans. Cumont's verdict is that, 'never did a people of advanced culture have a more infantile religion.' This dictum would have surprised the Romans, who believed themselves to be a very religious people. The matter depends on what we mean by religion, and it should be remembered that other Latin writers besides Lucretius use both the noun and its adjective in a disparaging sense. Polybius ascribed the public honesty of the Romans to their 'scrupulous fear of the gods,' and considered that nothing else contributed so much 'to hold together their commonwealth.' This Greek historian, however, finds signs that these habits and principles were already beginning to be corrupted. But when were these charges not brought? Wordsworth thought that 'plain living and high thinking are no more' during the war with Napoleon.

Religion in the ancient world involved every social function. The man who was excluded from the religion of his nation could not enter into its life. Ancient ceremonies brought the minds of the worshippers into tune with loyalty and patriotism; they were an important part of the 'ancient manners' by which, with its 'men,' the fortunes of Rome 'stand.' If we use the word religion in a narrower sense, the Roman sense of honour does not seem to have been very closely connected with it, except when an oath had to be sworn or a god invoked.

For the most part, the interest of the Romans was centred in the cult. Their prayers were like legal documents. Cicero's definitions of 'pietas' and 'sanctitas' are characteristic. The former is 'justice

towards the gods,' the latter is 'the art of worshipping them.' Still, as Cumont says, the poverty of the Roman religion was honest. Its gods were too nebulous to form a mythology, many of them being mere abstractions or personified qualities. But they were not human enough to set a bad example, and with the help of the censors they inculcated all the civic virtues.

Poetical myths and philosophy were alike frowned upon, with the result that rustic barbarism remained encrusted on the state religion. Divination and prodigies were recognized; if 'an ox in Etruria spoke,' something serious was portended. All this was tolerated by the educated, because the serious business of religion was to support morality and the state; it existed for this purpose. So when Augustus wished to reform morals, he rebuilt the temples. It was not expedient to emphasise the classification of Quintus Mucius Scaevola, the most learned of Roman pontiffs, who divided religion into the fiction of the poets, philosophy, and state religion which was merely an instrument of government.

Earlier chapters have dealt with the native religion of the Romans (Chapter 60), and with the first invasion of Greek ideas (Chapter 61). Here perhaps the most important thing to recognize is that the old Latin religion lingered on, especially in the country districts, long after the imported Greek mythology had been discredited and virtually abandoned. The last adherents of the old gods (except for a small group of conservative aristocrats) were the 'pagani,' the villagers. (Harnack, however, suggests that 'pagani' means rather 'civilians'.)



#### REPRESENTATIVES OF ROMAN ORTHODOXY

A fragment of the Altar of Peace set up by Augustus shows us members of the College of Flamens, or priests, all scions of noble families. These represented the state religion of Rome; and these persisted, alongside the new philosophic, religious and intellectual experiments, throughout the whole period under review.

*Uffizi Gallery, Florence; photo, Brogi*

It was not for nothing that S. Augustine gives so much space to ridiculing the old Roman godlets, whose names he found in Varro, instead of attacking the mystery cults which had long been fashionable in the towns and among the more educated. The scepticism of the decaying Republic, as Gwatkin says, belonged to the intellectual unrest of an age of political revolution. It vanished as the Empire settled down. Even in the upper classes it was not universal, and it scarcely touched the masses at all.

The dignified routine of the ancient ceremonies went on undisturbed. The upstart gods, for whom room had to be made, even within the sacred 'Pomerium' (city boundary), were not rivals, on equal terms, of the old Roman deities. There were flamens, pontiffs and augurs as of old, and the scions of the old families felt a pride in being admitted to the sacred colleges. The Vestal Virgins, the Arval Brethren and the Salii maintained the ancient ritual under the Empire of the third century. In religion, though not in philosophy, Rome proved stronger than Greece. Indeed, who can study Western Catholicism in modern times without acknowledging the truth of Augustine's words that the Roman Empire has been

'afflictum potius quam mutatum'—has been battered rather than changed?

There is always a probability that in any history the doings of the capital will receive an undue amount of attention, and that the tone of the literary class will give a false idea of the beliefs and opinions of the nation at large. In the city states of antiquity the capital was the nation. But after Rome became the head of a great empire it is impossible to speak of nationality, though even to-day, when we talk of the Latin countries, we assume that their inhabitants have some Roman blood in their veins. The Romanisation of the western provinces was rapid and almost complete. Seneca, Lucan, Martial and Trajan

were Spaniards. Rome itself produced hardly any more literary men of note.

The imperial city itself was always predatory and parasitic. Rome has never



#### UPHOLDER OF THE STATE RELIGION

The college of the twelve Arval Brethren was one of the ancient republican institutions whose prestige Augustus attempted to revive; the emperors enrolled themselves as Arvals, and here we see Marcus Aurelius garbed as one.

*British Museum*

been an industrial centre, and her empire must have appeared to her subjects little better than a 'grande latrocinium,' a vast system of brigandage, to quote a phrase of Augustine. Rome drained the wealth of the provinces—in return, it must in fairness be said, for very substantial benefits, especially the protection of the frontiers. But the ruling class in such a capital was not likely to be more religious than the French noblesse before the Revolution. Their prevailing temper was thorough-going rationalism, tempered by superstition and outward orthodoxy in observing the state cult.

It would be easy to illustrate the complete scepticism of the educated Romans at the end of the Republic and later. Lucretius is bitterly hostile to 'religio,' and is ready to cry, like Voltaire, 'Crush the monstrous thing.' Cicero is not always consistent, but in the *De Divinatione* he speaks like a Lucretius in prose:

To say the truth, superstition has spread among all peoples, and has captured almost every mind, taking advantage of human weakness. It is ever pursuing and driving us, whether a man listens to a prophet or an omen, whether he sacrifices a victim or catches sight of a bird of warning, whether he meets an eastern soothsayer or an Italian inspector of entrails, whether he sees lightning or hears thunder, or finds an object struck.

Julius Caesar was a complete agnostic. Ovid holds up the national gods to ridicule on all occasions; we need only refer to the passage where Jupiter, meditating an intrigue with a mortal woman, reflects:

This infidelity my wife will surely not find out; or if she does discover it, it is worth while—well worth while—to bear her scolding.

Juvenal says that only children believe in ghosts and the infernal regions. But this attitude is really inconsistent with the importance which that age attached to religion as a political fiction; for a fiction which deceives nobody is useless. Diodorus Siculus had said that though the

myths about the future life are pure fiction, 'they help to make men pious and upright,' and this was also the opinion of Varro. 'It is in the interest of states for men to be deceived in religion.' Such an opinion was commonly held.

Warde Fowler has said that the Italians in the period which we are now considering realized divinity in four ways. First, there were the domestic deities, like Vesta and the Penates, and the very interesting cult of the Genius, something between an 'astral soul' and a guardian angel, which was susceptible of important later developments. Secondly, men tended to look upon the great deity of the heavens, who was also the protecting deity of the State and Empire, as the same as the world-spirit of the philosophers. Thirdly, the inclination to recognize and even

adore a principle of blind chance or irresistible fate, identifying this with an old Roman cult of Fortuna, with which it had little to do, was widespread. Lastly, there was a tendency, which had existed for a long time in the eastern half of the Empire, to divinise rulers and men of great prominence, elevating them into the position of supernatural saviours. Underneath all these changes there was a strong tradition of 'virtus,' 'gravitas,' and 'simplicitas' (courage, seriousness and straightforwardness), the qualities of the idealised Roman character,



CHANCE DEIFIED

In spite of the rationalistic temper of upper-class Roman society, there was a tendency to deify such abstract conceptions as fate or chance, identified with the Roman goddess Fortuna.

British Museum

to which constant appeals are made by the great Augustan writers. It was this ideal above all others that prevented the Empire from going to pieces. Rationalism was very far from gaining a real victory.

The superstitions of the Romans were amazing. Augustus himself used a seal-skin as a protection against lightning, studied his dreams like a modern Freudian, and was much moved by portents. All nations, Cicero says, believe in divination, and all philosophers except Xenophanes and Epicurus. Lucretius knows something of the terrors from which he longs to deliver mankind. The atheist, says Plutarch, thinks there are no gods; the superstitious man wishes there were none. It distresses Plutarch deeply to see religion, which ought to be a source of elevated joy, turned into an instrument of torture.

The government was in a difficulty, because it failed to preserve the archaic superstitions, such as bird-divination, while suppressing new and unlicensed importations. Augustus burned two thousand books of 'curious arts' in one day.

On the whole, superstition grew during and after the first century. Aelian and Aristides push credulity almost to its last extreme; and Artemidorus, who collected stories about dreams, believed that he was writing a scientific treatise. The remedy against superstition is natural science, with its severe standard of evidence; and the decay of natural science under the Roman Empire is one of the strangest features of that era of civilization.

Such, in very brief outline, was the state of religion in Rome when 'philosophy' began to influence Roman ways of thinking. Cumont reminds us that we often forget how far the East was in advance of the West at this time. Indeed, the Empire itself was born in the Levant; if we cannot say that it was Oriental in its origin, it was certainly Hellenistic; and in the period which we shall have to consider later, when Christianity won its victory, it was Oriental in type. The Empire of the West no doubt was and remained fundamentally Roman, but, like the kingdoms of the Diadochi, it occupies a place in history between the city states of



**DIVINISATION OF AN EMPEROR: ANTONINUS BORNE TO HEAVEN**

An eastern element in Roman state religion during imperial times was the divinisation of the emperors after death—in the provinces they were even worshipped during their lifetime. Here we see Antoninus Pius and Faustina borne to heaven by Immortality, while Roma and the *Campus Martius* look on; the relief is on a base that once supported a column erected in honour of the Emperor.

*Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome; photo, Missions*

antiquity and the national states of modern times ; and the deification of the ruler was a Hellenistic practice borrowed from the East. In this chapter we are to consider the earlier contacts of Rome with Hellenistic philosophy, which preceded the orientalising of religion.

The social position of the philosophers is not unimportant. From the time of Scipio Aemilianus in the latter half of the second century B.C. we find Greek philosophers as honoured guests in the houses of the great nobles. This is the first stage of their influence upon Roman life. Then follows the great age of Roman Stoicism, strongly Republican in sympathies even long after the Empire was securely established. This philosophical opposition to the imperial system lasted till the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117-138). It was not often politically dangerous, and ended by being as harmless and romantic as the White Rose coterie in England to-day.

With Hadrian a third stage opens. The emperors endow professorial chairs of philosophy, and bestow dignities upon the professors. In this century neo-Platonism was beginning to absorb the other schools, and at last reigned supreme. Neo-Platonism was absolutely non-political and neutral in attitude towards the diverse forms of government. During this period several philosophers rose to high civic honours. Fronto, Polemo, Aristocles and Herodes Atticus were consuls. It is also important that with the decay of political Stoicism philosophy ceased to speak in Latin. Even the Emperor Marcus Aurelius writes in Greek.

When we moderns speak of philosophy, we think of some abstruse metaphysical system, such as is associated with the names of Kant, Hegel and Lotze. The earlier English usage included natural science under the name, and it became a joke in Germany that at Cambridge 'philosophical instruments' are sold in the shops. This use of the word testified to the historical fact that the earliest Greek philosophy was closely connected with science, and very loosely connected with religion. It is in fact only in Plato and the post-Aristotelian schools that this ceases to be true.

Aristotle had defined philosophy as the knowledge of things by their causes ; which is the principal end of modern science. But even in his time speculative interest was beginning to give way to definite practical aims. Not only does political and social reform hold a large place in the writings of Plato and Aristotle, but these thinkers are already building up an inner world of the spirit, a heavenly citizenship in which the philosopher may take refuge from the provoking of all men. The Platonic philosopher is not very different from the Stoic sage.

This tendency to make philosophy a complete substitute for religion, or to turn philosophy itself into a religion, was the natural result of the political changes which destroyed the free life of the Greek communities, and dissolved the connexion between their political and their moral life. Further, the very weak hold which the popular religion had upon conduct, and the scandals in which the old mythology abounded, prevented earnest men from doing what so many do now—making the dogmas of religion a peg on which to hang their own best thoughts. 'The godless man,' said Epicurus, 'is not he who denies the gods of the many, but he who ascribes to the gods what the many say about them.'

Lucretius protests that there is no real 'pietas' (piety) in bowing and prostrating oneself before an altar, in sacrifices and vows. But did not the Old Testament prophets say exactly the same? The function of philosophy was now to enlighten the conscience in problems of daily conduct. Marcus Aurelius says :

As surgeons keep their instruments to hand for sudden calls upon their skill, do you keep your principles always ready to test things divine and human, in every trifling act remembering the bond between the two. For no human act can be right without reference to the divine, and conversely.

In later antiquity, as for Matthew Arnold, conduct was three-fourths of life.

The individual was increasingly thrown back upon himself, as liberty decayed and the calls of patriotism grew faint. In a society where the hopes associated with a



belief in progress hardly existed, the aim of the individual was to make himself invulnerable and self-sufficient. This aim is at the bottom of all the later philosophies alike—Stoicism, Epicureanism and the later Platonism. The craving for deliverance gives the religion and philosophy of this period an Asiatic colouring, which does not oblige us to assume that there was any direct borrowing from India, though the name of 'Boutta' (the Buddha) was well known in Alexandria.

However, we shall see that this world-renouncing tendency was in sharp contradiction to the old Roman character, and

that the Romans embraced Stoicism and condemned Epicureanism precisely on account of the unmanly and selfish teaching which they associated with the latter. The two tendencies which are present in Stoicism—the one towards detachment and emancipation from the world, and the other towards active participation in the universal commonwealth, which is the city of God on earth—persist together in the Roman Stoics, somewhat inconsistently. We see exactly the same combination of opposing tendencies in Calvinism, which is the Christian form of Stoicism.

The founder of Stoicism, in the fourth century before Christ, was Zeno (c. 340-264; see page 1334), probably but not certainly a Phoenician, of Citium in Cyprus. It is curious that this philosophy, so congenial to the Western mind, should have been born in a Semitic environment. Chrysippus, who has been called the second founder of Stoicism, came from the half-Semitic Cilicia; and his successor, another Zeno, from Tarsus itself, the birthplace of S. Paul. The former Zeno made Athens his home and taught there, as a resident alien, till his death. The question has often been asked, whether there is anything Oriental in his philosophy. Edwyn Bevan is probably right in saying that the substance of his teaching was Greek, the dogmatic tone that of an Eastern prophet.

He borrowed from the Cynics, perhaps, his method of allegorising the myths. What was more important, Stoicism resembled Cynicism in its insistence on the simple life, an asceticism which had as

its object not so much the subjection of the flesh, as the attainment of complete independence of all externals. But Zeno had no sympathy with the attitude of brutal contempt for public opinion, and for the accepted decencies of civilized life, which was attributed rightly or wrongly to the earlier Cynics. It is only in Epictetus that the perfect Stoic seems to model himself on the complete renunciation characteristic of the Cynic, which passed into Christianity as the eremite ideal.

Like Buddhism, Stoicism sees in desire the main source of human misery. Happiness is to be found, not in multiplying our desires and gratifying them, but in willing nothing which is out of our reach. If we will only what exists, we are independent of the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. Even severe pain may be overcome by consenting to it as right and inevitable. This acquiescence can, of course, be justified only if we are convinced that the order of the world is rational and good. This forces the Stoics to formulate a theory of nature, though they were averse from theorising. It was necessary for their peace of mind to feel complete certainty about the constitution of the world in which we live.

This certainty, Zeno taught, is not beyond our capacities. There are convictions which come home to us so strongly that, in the philosopher's vivid language, they catch us by the hair and compel us to assent to them. This is, as Bevan says, a naïve theory of knowledge. But the Stoic did not believe himself to be infallible; it was only on certain subjects that we may be quite sure that we are not mistaken. As a modern philosopher has said, in every system we come at last to a point where a man must trust himself. Zeno brushed aside the objections of scepticism as every practical man must brush them aside. He had no scientific curiosity; he merely wished for a view of the world which would justify that inflexibility of the will which he advocated in his teaching. The power behind nature must be rational, otherwise there can be no rational life for man.

Zeno was content, on the whole, to take over the physical speculations of the old

Tenets of the  
Stoic Zeno

Ionians, especially of Heraclitus, who identified the primary matter of the universe with fire. This involved him in a kind of materialism, which was always a stumbling-block in the Stoic philosophy. He was obliged to maintain that the gods and the soul were 'bodies,' concrete realities. But since he insisted that the universe is a living being, he cannot properly be classed with the modern materialists. As Bishop Berkeley says:

Both Stoics and Platonics held the world to be alive. But in this there seems no atheism. For as long as the world is supposed to be quickened by elementary fire or spirit, which is itself animated by soul and directed by understanding, it follows that all parts thereof originally depend upon and may be reduced unto the same indivisible stem or principle, to wit, a Supreme Mind; which is the concurrent doctrine of Pythagoreans, Platonics and Stoics.

It was not to a blind dance of atoms that the Stoics bade us surrender our wills, but to a fate which is only another word for divine providence. Stoicism stood emphatically for a belief in providence; all things work together for good to the just and wise man. As Cleanthes says in his noble hymn to Zeus, 'Thou knowest how to make odd things even, to order what is disordered, and things that are not dear are dear to thee. For thus thou hast fitted together all things in one, good with evil, so that there arises one reasoned plan of the whole, enduring for ever.'

The controversy between free will and determinism is peculiarly awkward in Stoicism. Logically both **Free will & Determinism** Stoicism and Calvinism seem to be committed to that kind of pantheism which admits of only one will in the universe. But in practice there have been no more virile and self-assertive creeds than these two. When any thinker has solved the ancient puzzle as to how this can be, it will be time to blame this or that school of philosophy for inconsistency.

According to the Stoics the ruling principle in Man, which ought to direct all our actions, is a detached part of the cosmic Reason—a doctrine which opens a door towards mysticism. What the ruling principle approves has value; all else has no value. Nothing is good but

the good will, as Kant was to say later; all other things are 'indifferent.' Thus Stoicism draws the moral world in silhouette; there are no half tones. This abolition of all grades of good and bad was too harsh to be maintained, and the school admitted that some things—the good things of this life—are 'preferable' if we can have them, though they are not strictly good. As for the criterion by which we are to decide what things are right and what wrong, the maxim 'Live according to nature' was ambiguous. It may indicate the life which a man must lead if he is to realize the idea of his being—a true maxim which is

perhaps too vague to be of much use in practical decisions; or it may imply that the nearer a man is to primitive conditions, the better he achieves this end. So far as the Stoics approximated to this latter doctrine, we may trace the influence of Cynicism.

A certain hardness was recognized as being inseparable from Stoicism. It is part of the desire, already mentioned, to be invulnerable. The wise man will be helpful and benevolent, but he will feel no sympathy, he will not rejoice with those that rejoice nor weep with those that weep. 'Only weak eyes,' says Seneca, 'water at the misfortunes of another.' 'When you go to comfort the bereaved,' says Epictetus, 'you may sigh, but take care that the sigh does not come from the heart.' Nothing is more distinctive of Christianity than its frank abandonment of this protective armour.

This strong and proud creed was so congenial to the Roman temperament that it has been said that some of the old Republican heroes were Stoics without knowing it. Panaetius of Rhodes, a somewhat eclectic Stoic, was a friend of Scipio Aemilianus. But recent scholarship gives far more importance to Poseidonius of Apamea in Syria, who migrated to Rhodes, whither Cicero went to 'sit under' him, and Pompey, we are told, twice turned aside to visit him during his campaigns in the East. The writings of Poseidonius, who died about 51 B.C., are no longer extant. German scholars have delighted to find him behind Cicero, Plutarch and

Cosmic Reason the  
Ruling Principle

even Philo. If this be so, we have probably not lost much of original value in the works of the Rhodian philosopher. Poseidonius must have been an eclectic who eked out Zeno and Chrysippus with Plato, and thus prepared the way for the later fusion of the two philosophies.

Mommsen greatly understates the influence of Stoicism when he says that the practical results of

**Influence of Stoicism on Roman conduct** philosophy at Rome were hardly more than this, that 'two or three houses lived on poor fare to please the Stoa.' The great German historian does not speak so lightly of the younger Cato, who in life and death was a votary of Stoicism :

The unrelenting warfare which the ghost of the legitimate republic waged for centuries against the Caesarian monarchy was the legacy which the dying Cato bequeathed to his enemies. This republican opposition borrowed from Cato its whole attitude—stately, transcendental in its rhetoric, pretentiously rigid, hopeless and faithful to death; and accordingly it began even immediately after his death to revere as a saint the man who in his lifetime was not infrequently its laughing-stock.

Two of Cicero's philosophical works, the *De Officiis* (On Duties) and the *Tusculan Disputations*, deal with some of the great topics of Stoicism—especially how a man should bear himself when he is in trouble and in danger of death. But though Cicero undoubtedly derives much consolation from the Stoics, he is temperamentally more inclined to the Academic school, and cannot be ranked among the disciples of Zeno. For us, apart from the heroes of liberty, like Thræsea Paetus, Roman Stoicism means chiefly Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, though we must not forget Musonius Rufus, who, like the orator Dio Chrysostom, holds up a really Christian ideal of sexual morality.

Seneca's reputation has suffered from the large fortune which he amassed while acting as Nero's minister. The contrast between his creed and what we know of his worldly life is strange, but not stranger than that between the apparent splendour of his position and the haunting terror under which Nero's courtiers always lived. Philosophy was for him a genuine refuge

from an existence which would otherwise have been intolerable. Carlyle's gibe that he was 'the father of all such as wear shovel hats' is in intention as unfair to Seneca as to the average bishop.

Like other Stoics, Seneca is no philosopher in the modern sense. He is a preacher and spiritual adviser. He retains, indeed, the traditional division of philosophy into logic, physics and ethics; but he takes no interest in the first, and though his *Natural Questions* became a textbook of science in the Middle Ages, he has very little of the true scientific spirit—far less, for instance, than the Epicurean Lucretius. He likes to dwell on the vastness of the material universe, being unable, except when he ceases to be an orthodox Stoic, to dwell in thought upon the invisible home of the soul, eternal in the heavens. He sometimes uses Platonic and almost Christian language about the future life, as in the remarkable sentence: 'The day which you dread as your last is your birthday into eternity.' But this confidence was not justified by the doctrines of his school, and he did not always feel it.

Seneca is, as Dill says, the earliest (c. 4 B.C.—A.D. 65) and most powerful apostle of a great moral revival. Soon after his death there was a very noticeable reaction against the unbridled profligacy and extravagance of the earlier Caesars and their circle. He is a rhetorician, of course, as were the Christians Tertullian and Augustine; but of his earnestness and pathetic unhappiness there can be no doubt. In him the hardness of the pure Stoic creed is tempered by a truly religious yearning, which in the hands of the neo-Platonists was to transform philosophy into a quest of the beatific vision. In his thoughts about God, he wavers between the conception of the Deity as universal law or fate, and as the power within us which makes for righteousness, a wise and merciful Providence. These two ideas, as we have seen, were both held by the Stoic school.

Especially pleasing to the modern reader is his insistence on the brotherhood of Man. The earlier Roman Stoics had, perhaps, not found much in their philo-

sophy to make them shocked at the injustice of slavery; but Seneca deploras it with all his heart. Have we any right to complain, he asks, if in the state we have been deprived of the liberty which we have abolished in our own households? There was still much atrocious cruelty to slaves in the second century; but after Seneca's day some real improvement began. Harshness, the contemporaries of the younger Pliny sometimes say, is 'contrary to the spirit of our age.'

All through the writings of Seneca, we are conscious of a process of transition, in which the pride of the Stoic sage, though not wholly renounced, is giving way to a humbler and gentler temper. The part of the Stoic teaching which was to grow and bear fruit was not the isolation and detachment of the invulnerable 'wise man,' but the moral duties which flow from the recognition of universal human brotherhood. It is broadly true, though certain qualifications must be made, that in the earlier centuries of Christianity, down to S. Ambrose (c. 340-397), and even later, Christian ethics were predominantly Stoic, Christian philosophy predominantly Platonic.

For this humanising and spiritualising of Stoicism much credit belongs to Seneca. Partly through his influence, which was very great in later ages, Stoicism became incorporated in the Christian religion, and in Calvinism, as has been suggested above, it had a genuine revival within Christianity. Seneca was certainly no Christian, and never corresponded with S. Paul; but he has broken entirely with Paganism—much more completely than the devout neo-Platonists of the following centuries. His language about sin is something new in European thought:

We have all sinned, some in greater measure, some in less; some on purpose, some by accident, some by our own fault, some by the fault of others; we have not kept our good resolutions; in spite of our will and our resistance we have lost our innocence.

Every night he examined himself; 'the one goal of my days and nights is to put an end to my old faults.' 'Seneca saepe

noster'—Seneca is often one of us—said a Christian writer of him. He is indeed 'often one of us.'

Epictetus (c. A.D. 100) was a slave of Nero's freedman Epaphroditus, and while still in his service was allowed to hear the lectures of Musonius Rufus. He was given his freedom, and in his old age lived at Nicopolis in Epirus. Arrian, in the reign of Trajan, wrote down his discourses, and preserved Epictetus and them for posterity. They his discourses are full of earnest and devout piety, which occasionally reminds us of S. Francis.

If we had understanding, ought we to do anything else than praise God and sing of his benefits? While we are digging and ploughing and eating, ought we not to sing this hymn? Great is God, who has given us these implements to till the earth; great is God, who has given us hands, and organs to breathe and digest our food. What else can I do, a lame old man, than sing hymns to God? If I were a nightingale, I would do the part of a nightingale; if a swan, I would do like a swan. But as I am a rational creature, my work is to praise God, and I will not cease to do so. I exhort you to join in the same song.

He makes much of the daemon or guardian angel, to whom Zeus has committed the care of every one of us, a guardian who never sleeps nor is deceived. When you have shut your door and made darkness within, never say that you are alone, for you are not; God is within, and your daemon is within, and what need they of light to see what you are doing? To this God you ought to swear an oath, as the soldiers do to Caesar. And what shall you swear? Never to be disobedient, never to make any charges, never to find fault with what he sends, never unwillingly to do or bear anything that comes to you. 'Dare to look up to God and say, Deal with me for the future as thou wilt; I am thine; I refuse nothing that pleases thee; lead me where thou wilt.' Unlike Seneca, Epictetus condemns suicide, the refuge of so many noble Romans in the first century. 'Friends, wait for God,' he said. 'When he shall give the signal and release you from his service, then go to him; but for the present endure to remain where he

has put you. Wait then; do not depart without a reason.'

It is curious that he goes back to Diogenes 'the Dog' for a model of the highest life. His ideal is to be 'a true Cynic.' He is far more uncompromising than Seneca; and we find in him that brutal contempt for the female sex, and that abnegation of natural human affection, which also formed the most unlovely side of some cloistered saints under Catholicism. The ascetics of the desert and the begging friars are the Cynics of Christianity. It is, however, fair to Epictetus to say that he abhorred personal uncleanness—'If a man will not wash, let him either go into a desert, or live alone and smell himself.'

After Epictetus Stoicism declined. It had been first a system of philosophy and then a religion—a far more vital faith among the Romans than it ever was among the Greeks. Henceforth the Stoic literature was a quarry for preachers; but men were no longer Stoics. Nor is it difficult to understand why their teaching began to be neglected. Stoicism segregated a man too completely. As Dr. Glover has said, the Stoic manned and provisioned the fortress, and then cut it off from supplies and from relief. The Stoic knows nothing between the individual and the universe; his system withers love and affection. The same teachers who instructed man to follow nature taught him to repress the best part of nature; and we are now learning how unwise that is. To quote Dr. Glover, the Stoics made a solitude in the heart and called it peace.

Moreover, their religion was too bare to suit average humanity. While they dis-

posed with all the old mythology, and worshipped natural law and the light within, their

contemporaries were craving for ritual and sacraments, and dabbling in magic. The Stoical hope of immortality flickered and burnt dimly—Seneca can give his wife only cold comfort after the death of their child: 'He is either happy or non-existent.' They could hardly be said to worship a personal Deity. 'I put myself in the hands of a Stoic,' says Justin Martyr; 'but when I got no

further in the matter of God—for he did not know himself, and told me that such knowledge was unnecessary—I left him.'

The emperor Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 121-180) follows the slave Epictetus in the roll of honour of Roman Stoics. He has been called by Frederick Myers the saint and exemplar of agnosticism. This means that he was no true Stoic, for the Stoics knew their own minds. Renan thinks that the *Meditations* of Marcus, which are an honest soliloquy, 'To Himself,' 'will ever remain young in its life and truth.' The phrase is not a happy one. The little book is one of the treasures of devotional literature, but it is neither young nor full of life. It belongs to a 'fin de siècle' when men were feeling that the world had grown old.

The emperor himself, dreamy, sensitive and hopeless, was not fit for his position. He did his duty without enthusiasm, and consoled himself with the precepts of a philosophy in which he never showed himself quite an adept. Dr. Glover quotes a typical passage—there are many others which would do just as well—a passage which shows precisely the temper which makes a man useless as a practical statesman:

Marcus Aurelius  
the Agnostic

Ever the same are the cycles of the universe, up and down, for ever and ever. Either the intelligence of the whole puts itself in motion for each separate effect—in which case accept the result it gives; or else it did so once for all, and everything is in sequence, one thing in another. In a word, either God, and all goes well, or all at random. Live thou not at random. The universal cause is like a winter torrent; it carries all before it. How cheap then these poor statesmen, who carry philosophy into practical affairs, as they fancy—poor diminutive creatures, drivellers. Man, what then? Do now what nature demands. Hope not for Plato's Republic, but be content if the smallest thing advance. Go now and talk of Alexander and Philip and Demetrius of Phalerum. If they played the tragic actor, no one has condemned me to follow them. Think of the life lived by others . . . and how neither memory is of any account, nor glory, nor anything at all. . . . Either the gods have no power, or they have power. If they have not, why pray? If they have, why not pray for deliverance from fear or desire or pain, rather than for the withholding or giving of a particular thing?



#### MARCUS AURELIUS AS PAGAN PRIEST

One appreciates the 'Stoicism' of Marcus Aurelius at its true worth in face of reliefs like this: we see the Emperor as priest sacrificing before an altar, and everything goes to show that he was a devout adherent of the old religion.

*The Louvre*

Almost everything Stoical has disappeared from this philosophy except the duty of resignation, and the conviction that whether the world without be chaos or cosmos, it rests with us to make the world within a cosmos. It is this remnant of faith which makes him the prophet of so many in our day, when men who can find no secure place to stand upon still repudiate spiritual bankruptcy. But this saint of agnosticism is no true follower of Zeno. His little book is the swan-song of what was once a robust philosophy.

One curious change has come over Stoicism between Seneca and Marcus. There has been a great revival of the old Roman ritual with its sacrificial cult. The emperor was a great slaughterer of cattle in honour of the gods. There is an old epigram which runs 'We the white cows send our greeting to Marcus the Caesar. But if you are victorious, we are done for.' As Rendall has said, 'To this punctilious and devout form of paganism Marcus was inured from childhood; at the vintage festival he took his part in

chant and sacrifice; at eight years old he was admitted to the Salian priesthood; he was observed to perform all his sacerdotal functions with a constancy and exactness unusual at that age; was soon a master of the sacred music; and had all the forms and liturgies by heart. In his triumphal bas-reliefs he stands before the altar, a robed and sacrificing priest.'

And yet—for he was after all an autocrat—he tortured and killed the Christians for their 'obstinacy' in refusing to join in these established ceremonies. The time was to come—nay, it had already come—when the true inheritors of the Stoic tradition were to be found, not on the throne but in the arena, not with the magistrate in his chair of judgement, but with the uncompromising members of the 'third race' who were brought before him. Marcus Aurelius is among the last of the Pagan Stoics; but that creed had a new life in the Christian Church, in Tertullian, in Ambrose, in the Scottish Covenanters.

Zeno and Epicurus (341-270 B.C.) were contemporaries, and keen rivals while they taught at Athens. This rivalry continued throughout antiquity. In the Roman world the two systems divided between themselves the support of almost all who cared to think. We cannot say precisely when Epicureanism first appeared at Rome. Among the envoys from Athens who came to Rome in 155 B.C. to plead the cause of their country in the political question of the town of Oropus there was no Epicurean, though the Academics, Peripatetics and Stoics had each a representative. The names Epicurus and of obscure Epicureans at his doctrines Rome survive, and we hear that they made many converts; but the only great Roman Epicurean is Lucretius.

Several of Cicero's friends, including Pomponius Atticus, belonged to the sect, and Cicero received his first lessons in philosophy from Phaedrus, an Epicurean. Vergil also attended Epicurean lectures in his boyhood, and learned from them to 'free his mind from all care.' Philodemus, an Epicurean writer of the Ciceronian age, has had the curious fortune to have his works disinterred in scraps from a villa at Herculaneum. Cicero refers to him as 'a certain Greek whom I know to be a person

of refinement.' The school survived to be endowed at Athens by Marcus Aurelius, but it was detested by Stoics and Platonists alike, and in the fourth century was practically extinct. The Emperor Julian thanks the gods that even the books of the Epicureans are now hard to procure.

The pious Apostate spoke the truth. The writings of the early Epicureans, and of the founder, have entirely disappeared, and we have to rely for our knowledge of the system partly on the great poem of Lucretius, *On Nature*, and partly on the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius, a compilation made in the third century A.D. These sources of information are eked out by numerous references in Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, Stobaeus and Athenaeus.

What we know of Epicurus and his teaching is far removed from our modern notion of an 'epicure.' Seneca tells us :

When the stranger comes to the Garden over which the words are written, 'Friend, you will do well to abide here ; here pleasure is the highest good,' he will find the keeper of the Garden a kindly, hospitable man, who will set before him a dish of porridge and a bowl of water, and will say, 'Hast thou not been well entertained ?' This Garden does not whet hunger, but quench it ; it allays thirst by a natural remedy which costs nothing. In pleasure like this I have grown old.

The Epicureans were not ascetics, but they lived, on principle, with extreme simplicity. Epicurus condemned

**Some typical Epicurean maxims** damned no simple and natural enjoyments, but they must be both

simple and natural. The greatest of all pleasures is friendship. The school of Epicurus inculcated genial and affectionate relations among all its members, and if a large proportion of them were women, it is not necessary to believe the scandals circulated by their enemies.

The following maxims will give a fair notion of the moral teaching of Epicurus :

If you can live by nature you will never be poor ; if by opinion [fashion], you will never be rich.

You must be a bondman to philosophy, if you wish to gain true freedom. We ought to choose some good man, and do everything, as it were, under his eyes.

It is an evil to live in necessity ; but there is no necessity to live in necessity.

The fool is always beginning to live.

To dine without a friend is the life of a lion or a wolf.

If you would make a man happy, do not add to his riches but take away from his desires.

The influence of Epicureanism as a philosophy at Rome was far less than that of Stoicism. Rome contained plenty of epicures, who may have called themselves Epicureans ; but these 'pigs of Epicurus' sty,' as Horace calls them, only brought discredit on a theory of life which was amiable and harmless, if not heroic and public-spirited. But the Romans, both from the Epicureanism strength of their sense of in Rome public duty and from their rather gross notions of pleasure, were by nature as antagonistic towards Epicureanism as they were in sympathy with Stoicism.

Yet it was capable of evoking great enthusiasm and unbounded loyalty in minds for which ignoble self-indulgence held no temptation. Lucretius is convinced that Epicurus has finally delivered mankind from two of the greatest evils, the fear of the gods and the fear of death. This liberation has been brought about by teaching the true principles of natural science—the atomic theory of Democritus, slightly modified by Epicurus. From the modern point of view, this theory is in part valuable—it contains remarkable anticipations of some new discoveries, and every Darwinian is thrilled by Lucretius' sketch of the struggle for life and the survival of the fittest—and in part fanciful.

But the atomic theory has no close connexion with the philosophy of pleasure, and the Romans were not much interested in scientific discoveries. 'Atheism' was a convenient tin kettle to tie to the tail of a discredited philosophy, and the Epicureans shared with the Christians the reproach of impiety. The succession of practising Epicureans will never die out among cultivated men and women, but such are usually content to enjoy life without making disciples.

In this chapter I have dealt only with Hellenic or Hellenistic influences upon Roman belief and practice. There were other importations, from Asia, which must be considered separately in Chapter 74.

# THE FLOURISHING OF ART AND ARCHITECTURE

Rome's native Genius at Work upon the  
blended Heritage of Greek and Etruscan Art

By H. B. WALTERS F.S.A.

Keeper of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum;  
Author of *Art of The Romans*, etc.

NOR so many years ago it was the fashion to regard Roman art, and in particular Roman sculpture, as a debased and purely imitative successor of Greek art, devoid of all originality and true artistic feeling. It is, indeed, in many respects true that the Romans were not an artistic people in the same sense as the Athenians of the age of Pericles or the Florentines in the heyday of the Renaissance; their true genius lay mainly in other directions. Vergil, in a well known passage, contrasts the Roman genius for conquest and empire with the more intellectual instinct of the Greeks; and Horace says that 'captive Greece overcame her savage conqueror and introduced the arts into rustic Latium.' Nor is this mere poetical licence. The conquest of Hellas, which was consummated by the capture of Corinth in 146 B.C., effected a change in the mental outlook of the Romans, which has already been discussed in Chapters 58 and 61.

On the other hand, recent researches have brought into prominence a truth which the nineteenth-century enthusiasm for Greek art had tended to obscure, namely that there is such a thing as native Roman art, pursuing its own lines independently of the Greek influences with which it never entirely coalesced. The origin of this art we must seek in the neighbouring region of Etruria, which, although in the first place owing its culture largely to Greek sources, yet embarked on an artistic course peculiarly its own from the beginning of the sixth century onwards. And it must be remembered that such 'Roman' art as we possess from the time of the Kings down

to the middle of the republican period was really Etruscan, and nothing but Etruscan. It was the Etruscans who built and decorated such temples as that of Ceres near the Circus Maximus, and the great temple of the three Capitoline deities on the Capitol. The architecture of these buildings was what Vitruvius, our only authority on the subject, describes as Tuscan, and quite distinct in character and principle from the Doric and Ionic systems of Greece.

In spite of the powerful influence that Greek art always exercised on Etruscan art, which is visible in nearly all its productions, especially those of earlier times, the latter *Naturalism* of always retains an inherent *Etruscan art* passion for naturalism, which we shall see to be a marked characteristic of all purely Italian art of the classical period. Among the Etruscans this manifests itself most strongly in a gift for realistic portraiture, a legacy which was handed on in full being to their Roman successors. In the earlier art of Etruria, which was more directly under Greek influence and the conventions of archaic art (see Chap. 38), this gift was still latent, though there are one or two early statues and busts, such as the bronze bust (c. 600 B.C.) from the Polledrara Tomb at Vulci in the British Museum, which seem to show that it already existed.

Two salient features of Etruscan life and thought were a firm belief in a future life, and a reverence for ancestors. Accordingly their native art was devoted chiefly to the embellishment of the abodes of their dead, and the custom of preserving lifelike memorials of them became





#### METHODS OF ETRUSCAN ART

Etruscan art was the basis of native Italian developments. How this art, though owing much to Greece in the first instance, pursued an independent course is shown by this urn relief, obviously based on a Greek painting of which the Alexander Mosaic in page 1436 is a copy.

*From 'I Relievi delle Urne Etrusche'*

universal. The tombs of the later Etruscan period are full of cinerary urns, usually of rectangular form, in clay or stone. On the covers of these are effigies of the occupants, usually very rudely executed, but still preserving a marked individuality in their features. Some are indeed of exceptional merit, both in conception and execution, notably the effigy from Chiusi of Seianti Hanunia, now in the British Museum; it dates from the third century B.C. The Etruscans also favoured the practice of adorning their houses with portraits of their ancestors, usually in the form of busts, a practice which was subsequently adopted by the Romans who placed such portrait studies in the 'atria' (entrance-halls or courts) of their houses.

There are also some remarkable instances of portrait-figures in bronze, notably the so-called 'Arringatore' or statue of the orator Aulus Metilius in Florence dating from about 200 B.C. (see page 1921), and the bust of the so-called Brutus at Rome. The former may perhaps be regarded as a Roman quite as much as an Etruscan work, although found in Etruria (near Lake Trasimene); but there are other examples, such

as the head of a bearded man from the Lake of Falterona, now in the British Museum, which is purely Etruscan in style, and no less excellent in execution, nor probably less truthful as a portrait.

In another branch of art, that of architecture, the Romans did not, perhaps, owe so much to Etruria, although the earlier republican buildings of Rome were the works of Etruscan architects, and entirely Italian in style and conception. Hardly anything now remains in Rome, or indeed in Etruria either, as evidence of this Etrusco-Roman architecture, but we know, for instance, what their temples were like from the description given by Vitruvius. The 'Tuscan' style of architecture, as he terms it, shows a marked difference from the contemporary Greek styles, and the temples were built on an entirely different plan. The columns were quite plain in form, and if there was any sculptured decoration it was usually executed in terra-cotta.

The temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome was built in this style by Etruscan architects, and consisted of three parallel cellae or 'naves,' one for each of the three Capitoline deities (Jupiter, Juno and Minerva), opening in front on a colonnade. This style was adhered to in many later temples in Rome.

Rome's debt to Etruria was not, of course, confined to artistic achievements. Etruscan religious rites and Etruscan skill in building and engineering left their mark on the younger nation in what



#### SOURCE OF ROME'S GENIUS FOR PORTRAITURE

Rome's one outstanding contribution to art, the gift of portraiture, she seems definitely to owe to Etruscan influence. This appears even from the early Etruscan pieces in Chapter 38: but the later effigies on cinerary urns, such as this fine portrait of Seianti Hanunia from Chiusi, clinch the matter.

*British Museum*

has been described as 'a groundwork of Italian ruggedness'; and, as we have seen, not only in the time of the Kings, but all through the earlier part of the republican period, Roman culture was really Etruscan. But two causes operated to establish by degrees what may be regarded as genuine Roman art. One was the rapid disappearance of a distinctly Etruscan civilization, due to the growing power of Rome; the other, a revival of Greek influence, which, however, now made itself felt not in Etruria, but in Rome itself. The change was also largely brought about by the Punic Wars, which gave such a great impetus to the development of the Roman people.

The story of Roman art is henceforth the story of the blending of two apparently opposite principles, the somewhat artificial Hellenic culture and the unsophisticated realism of native Italian art. This is well exemplified in the engraved gems of the period, which

illustrate what an eminent authority has described as 'old Roman art.' Modern criticism has distinguished from the ordinary ruck of 'Graeco-Roman' gems a series which is of markedly distinct style, and forms a connecting link with the Etruscan gems. They date from the last two centuries of the Roman Republic (or rather about 300-100 B.C.), and the subjects are often taken from Roman legend or religion. On the other hand, there are gems of the same period which bear the impress of Hellenistic Greek influence both in style and subject. With the Hellenising of Roman culture the former style is gradually merged in the latter, and the Greek artist triumphed. The same style appears in the Ficoroni cista ('casket') at Rome, a fine example of bronze engraving by an artist who bears the purely Latin name of Novios Plautios, though probably trained in a Greek school. It dates from about 200 B.C.



IMPRESSIONS FROM ROMAN INTAGLIOS

Between the earlier Etruscan and the later Greek gems we find a series distinct in style and Roman in subject; probably, therefore, a product of native Roman art. 1. Agate; youth with wine jar. 2. Roman warrior. 3. Onyx; Roman priest. 4. Carnelian; Faustus finding the wolf suckling Romulus and Remus. 5. Carnelian; wounded hero and supporters.

British Museum

What Roman art could do when untrammelled by exterior influences is well shown in a monument in the British Museum, which appears to be in its way a unique phenomenon (see page 1922). This is a cinerary urn, or rather the front part of one, constructed in a method familiar in Etruscan art, but in no other respect Etruscan. It is decorated with a representation of an equestrian procession, and undoubtedly has some reference to Roman religious ceremonial, as is shown by the costume of the horsemen, the equipment of their steeds, and other details. It probably represents the parade of Roman Knights by which the victory of Lake Regillus was annually commemorated on the Ides of July. Neither in style nor in subject does there appear to be any parallel to this among existing monuments. It is an undoubted additional piece of evidence for the existence of a native Roman art, free from the lifeless conventions of Etruscan work, and as yet untouched by the sophistications of later Greek art. Its keynote is straightforward and unpretentious simplicity.

Having said this much by way of introduction, we may now pursue the subject of Roman art through its various phases from the second century B.C. down to the

introduction of Christianity. And first we may consider the achievements of the Romans in a sphere which they made specially their own, that of architecture.

As we have already seen, the buildings of the earlier Republican period in Rome were the work of Etruscan architects, and wholly Etruscan in character. Of these buildings, indeed, we really know very little except what ancient writers tell us, owing to the extensive reconstruction which took place under Augustus and his successors, when the Romans had become familiar with the principles of Greek architecture and their buildings tended to lose their old individuality. There are, however, a few buildings which were reconstructed on the old lines, such as the circular temple of Vesta in the Forum (see relief in page 1736) or which preserved features of the older style, such as the triple cella

or the high raised base. But the typical Italian ground plan of the temple was soon combined with the Greek peripteral colonnade, and Tuscan details were supplanted by adaptations of the Greek Orders, as the Doric, Ionic and Corinthian methods of shaping, ornamenting and disposing of columns and their adjuncts have been called (see page 1308).

Roman temples have, indeed, been described as 'Etruscan or Italian buildings in Greek dress.' One important difference, however, is that in many Roman temples the columns do not form a detached colonnade, but are sunk into the walls (an arrangement known as 'pseudo-peripteral'). A good example of this is the temple of Fortuna Virilis, erected in 78 B.C. in the Ionic style, and now one of the oldest existing examples of Roman architecture (see page 1746). The only other existing building of the republican period is the Tabularium, or Record Office, on the Capitoline Hill, erected in the same year as the former. The characteristic feature of these buildings is the employment of the architectural orders in a purely decorative way, in order to enrich the wall-surface.

Their modification of Etruscan architectural principles is typical of the character of the Roman people. They were not inventive geniuses on the one hand, nor mere copyists on the other; but they never lost their individuality and all their work was on essentially practical lines. The discovery (or perhaps it is more correct to say rediscovery) of the principle of the constructional arch had very far-reaching effects. For one thing, it enabled them to substitute vaults (see further in Chapter 72) for flat roofs, and so to cover great spaces with more facility, and thus we find through the imperial period a



#### ROMAN APPRENTICESHIP IN GREEK ART

The Ficoroni 'cista' or coffer is a most interesting document. The engraving on the body, one would have said, is unquestionably Greek; but it is signed on the lid by Novios Plautios, a Roman name, while feet and handle are of Romano-Etruscan workmanship. Parts of the engraving are developed above and in page 1545.

Kircheriano Museum; photo, Anderson



#### THE CORINTHIAN ORDER IN ROME

Rome's rather florid taste preferred the Corinthian to the other Greek orders; and even imparted added floridity to it, as this column capital from the Temple of Castor and Pollux shows. Compare the drawing in page 1308.

steady advance in skill and boldness of construction, in which the Pantheon is a midway landmark, culminating in the vast Baths of Caracalla.

The greatness of Roman architecture, it has been said, consists not in its formal completeness, but in its solution of constructive problems and in the development of vertical building. Even after other arts had sunk into mediocrity, vaulting continued to be developed, and the Basilica of Constantine shows an actual advance on earlier efforts. It was in fact architectural construction rather than beauty of outline or decorative effect that appealed to the practical Roman genius.

Another feature of Roman architecture is that, whereas the Greek architects devoted their genius almost exclusively to temples, their constructional problems being for the most part of a simple nature, the Romans regarded secular public buildings as of equal importance, and their construction necessarily involved a much greater variety and freedom of plan and detail. Again, in their baths and similar buildings they succeeded in evolving the most elaborate arrangement of rooms, such as the Greeks had never dreamed of, and could never have accomplished with the limitations of their systems. Where in

Greece a connected group of buildings is found, as for instance at the shrine of Asclepius at Epidaurus, each building is a separate unit in itself; whereas in Rome a whole combination of temples, baths and basilicae might be included under one roof. Roman buildings were capable of indefinite extension both horizontally and also (though in a more limited degree) vertically. The Baths of Caracalla is an instance of the former, the Colosseum of the latter.

The use which the Romans made of the various orders of classical architecture is also of some interest. It must always be remembered that at Rome, as also in Greece, the use of these orders was not as a rule successive, like the different Gothic styles in England. In Greece the preference for one style over the other was chiefly due to local reasons, the Ionic order, for instance, being almost invariably used in Asia Minor. In Rome, again, though the Doric and Ionic buildings found there are usually earlier than Corinthian, it is only because in imperial times the latter style appealed more generally to Roman taste. The Tuscan style of early Rome was not, strictly speaking, a distinct order, and is only distinguished by the form of the capital and the unfluted column with



#### SPECIMEN OF 'COMPOSITE' STYLE


With the Ionic order Rome played havoc, introducing tedious ornament and finally adding to the column capitals the acanthus leaves of the Corinthian; this 'composite' style is illustrated by the fragment above from Trajan's Forum.

base. It is in fact the Italian version of the Doric order. It was only employed during the Republic, before the advent of Greek influence.

The Corinthian order attained the height of its popularity at Rome; in Greece, indeed, it was almost unknown. But the Romans introduced it in buildings as early as the second century B.C., and, moreover, largely improved and developed the form of the capital, which alone distinguishes the Corinthian from the Ionic order. It is best exemplified in the Pantheon and the temple of Castor in the Forum. The 'composite,' capital which combined Ionic and Corinthian details, or rather was developed from the Ionic by the addition of acanthus leaves, was first introduced in the first century of the Empire. It is to be seen in the Arch of Titus and the Forum of Trajan, in which buildings we have virtually a new Roman style, combining the various features of all the orders.


As has already been noted, the Roman temple is not, like the Greek, the chief

expression of national architecture. Not that the Romans were an irreligious people, for in many ways their religious instincts were stronger than those of the Greeks, but these had a more subjective basis, and they did not, therefore, feel the same need for outward expression. As we have seen, the essentially practical Roman mind, which Pliny describes as 'savagely utilitarian,' regarded their basilicae, baths and fora as being of equal importance with their temples, and in this respect (as in many others) there is the same parallel with Greece that exists between modern civilization and the Middle Ages. For the Greeks, as for the medieval builder or craftsman, art was essentially the handmaid of religion, and in studying the achievements of both it is necessarily to their sacred buildings that we turn. We should hardly do so for the work of the Victorian Era, and, similarly, in the case of the Romans it is their secular architecture that evokes the greatest interest. Though some of the Roman temples



**GRANDEUR OF THE HUGE TEMPLES AT BAALBEK IN SYRIA**

Roman architecture is displayed to the best advantage in secular buildings; in temple construction there were experiments, sometimes fantastic, but little that can be ranked very high. In Rome itself the Pantheon, illustrating the novel use of vaulting for temples, is an exception; and in the provinces the buildings at Baalbek stand alone. Here the arch was for the first time combined with Greek architecture. The two temples were dedicated by Antoninus Pius in the second century.



#### FINEST OF ROMAN TEMPLES: THE PANTHEON AS IT WAS AND AS IT IS

Some of the earliest Roman temples were circular, like a peasant's hut, and it is interesting to see that this tendency was not swamped by Greek influence. Even in imperial times we find a temple like the so-called Pantheon of Agrippa being built—probably as late as the reign of Hadrian, for it seems that only the pillared portico can be assigned to the temple erected by Agrippa to the divine patrons of the house of Augustus which was burnt down not long afterwards.

*Reconstruction, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; photo, Donald McLeish*

present remarkable features of construction or architectural detail, there are at any rate none conspicuous for beauty or grandeur and with the exception of the great buildings at Baalbek in Syria the same applies to the provinces.

A peculiarly Roman development was the circular temple, the type of which was probably derived from the circular hut of Romulus on the slopes of the Palatine Hill.

Of this type a well known example still exists in Rome. The charming little temple in the Forum Boarium near the Tiber, with its modern tiled roof, familiar to us from old pictures of Rome, remains practically complete, with its colonnade of graceful Corinthian columns. It dates from the reign of Augustus, and has borne different names, but is probably dedicated to Mater Matuta or the sea-deity Portunus (see page 1734).

The Pantheon, which was originally erected in 27 B.C., marks a revival of this primitive style. It consists of a rotunda surmounted by a dome, 142 feet in diameter and 140 feet high, with a large portico, and is certainly one of the finest of Roman temples. The present building is a restoration of the time of Hadrian. In the combination of a circular domed structure with a triple-chambered portico we may observe a method of construction which was afterwards developed in Byzantine and Romanesque architecture, and may even be reflected in the Round Churches of the Templars in England.

It was not until the beginning of the imperial period that the Romans began to pay special attention to secular architecture. Hitherto even the gods had been modestly housed, and as Juvenal says, 'nowhere did marble spoil the effect of the native tufa.' It was only the ambition of the emperors which began to cover Rome with splendid buildings for all kinds of purposes, public and domestic, and this began with Augustus and his familiar boast that he found a Rome of brick and left one of marble. So the space on the north side of the Forum came to be filled with new Fora, each containing temples, law-courts and commemorative monuments, and on the opposite side the

Palatine Hill was entirely covered with the palaces of the Caesars. Thus Republican Rome became gradually transformed out of recognition.

The series of great buildings which was inaugurated in the reign of Augustus included the Fora of the emperors, which were surrounded by temples, basilicae and other official structures, theatres and amphitheatres, public baths and imperial residences. These were mostly built of concrete with a facing of brick, and again covered with stucco or marble. For the constructional problems involved, especially vaulting and the combination of arch and pillar, and for illustrations of typical buildings from the Colosseum to the Palace of Diocletian, see Chapter 72.

The main difference between Greek and Roman sculpture is that the one is essentially idealising in its aims, the other is realistic, and mani-

fest itself mainly in **Greek and Roman portraits of living Sculpture contrasted** people or in reliefs recording historical events. In dealing therefore with Roman sculpture, we must employ a somewhat different method from that which would be appropriate in treating of Greek. There is no question of special well defined schools or of eminent artists, nor again is it a matter of a continuous development and subsequent decadence, as in Greek art. Roman art is eclectic, and exhibits different tendencies at different times, quite independent of each other, and arising out of the imitative and unoriginal character of the Roman artist. To such work it is consequently often difficult to assign an exact date; it is not, for instance, always easy to distinguish Roman work from that of the later Greek or Hellenistic period, and when we are dealing with obvious Roman copies of Greek work the difficulty is, of course, still more accentuated.

The fact is that except in the two branches of portraiture and historical monuments, Roman art is not of independent native growth. These two phases and their chief characteristics will be duly considered in their turn, but a few words must first be said on the relation of Roman sculpture to that of Greece, and the influence exercised by the latter.



FINE PRODUCT OF 'NEW-ATTIC' STYLE

A tendency in Augustan times to imitate particular schools of Greek art is well shown in this relief of a 'Pyrrhic' or military dance. It derives from an Attic style of the fifth century B.C.; but notice that the figures facing in the same direction are almost exact replicas of each other.

*Vatican Museum, Rome*

Roman sculpture in the round, and also to some extent in relief, nearly all falls under one of two heads: copies and imitations. Sculptures which are obvious copies of Greek works of art have their value for the light they throw on the history of Greek art and the work of Greek artists, but they have no meaning whatever as examples of Roman art. They are in fact the work of Greek artists trained in Greek methods, and were made for their wealthy Roman patrons who had acquired a taste for art somewhat similar to that of the modern parvenu.

Imitations of Greek work on the other hand aimed at reproducing the style of some particular school or period rather than individual works. There was even a fashion about the time of Augustus—somewhat analogous to the pre-Raphaelite movement—of reproducing the archaic Greek style. In another contemporary class of works, known as the 'new-Attic' reliefs, a somewhat later period is imitated, namely the Attic work of the second quarter of the fifth century B.C., which was characterised by a quaint and delicate refinement. In these we find certain types repeated over and over again, or variously combined, until they become little more than decorative motives. Hence they come to be reproduced in other materials, such as metal work and pottery. The school of Pasiteles again, which also flourished in the Augustan age, endeavoured

to reproduce the characteristics of this period of Greek art, while that of Arcesilaus combined with the idyllic tendencies of the Hellenistic period a naturalistic treatment of landscape and plant-forms which plainly show the influence of Alexandrine taste in Rome. In none of these movements is there anything which can be called distinctively Roman.

For that we must turn to the Ara Pacis Augustae, or altar erected in 13 B.C. by Augustus to Imperial Peace, in commemoration of his victories in Spain and Gaul. It stood in the Campus Martius,

and is certainly the greatest achievement of the decorative art of the Augustan age. But it also introduces a new principle into commemorative sculpture, in its glorification of the Roman Emperor, a principle which as we shall see is peculiarly Roman and more than anything else gives an individual character to the art of the imperial period. The Greeks commemorated historical events



ORNAMENT DERIVED FROM NATURE

Subject figures from the famous Ara Pacis, or altar dedicated to Peace by Augustus, are given in pages 1862 and 1900. This fragment, showing purely decorative reliefs, is a good illustration of the graceful naturalism of the Augustan age.

*Museo delle Terme, Rome; photo, Anderson*





## ETRUSCAN AND GREEK INFLUENCE MEET

The Etruscans, we have seen, were responsible for Roman skill in portraiture. These two terra-cotta heads show the transition. Both are Roman; but whereas the first (left) is almost purely Etruscan in style, in the second (a relief) there has appeared more than a trace of Greek idealisation.

*British Museum*

by monuments on which heroic or mythical legends were celebrated, such as battles of the gods and giants, or Greeks and Amazons; but the Romans either depicted the events themselves, or else the personages concerned in them, in a more or less idealised fashion.

The Ara Pacis is a monument of the latter type. It represents members of the imperial house and Roman nobles assembled to sacrifice at the new altar, with a procession in honour of the goddess of Peace on one side, and on the other an allegorical group of Tellus, the Earth mother, and attendant deities (see page 1862). In the last-named group the treatment is essentially pictorial; and in the decoration generally (see preceding page) we see the naturalism of the Augustan age at its best.

It has already been suggested that one of the most successful and characteristic phases of Roman art was portraiture. In this branch of art the Romans found full scope for their realistic tendencies, and it was maintained at a high level even down to the degenerate days of the later Empire. Nor is it always among the official portraits of the emperors that we find the highest achievements. There are many busts in our museums representing unknown, perhaps even obscure, individuals, yet which have their value as showing 'with matter-of-fact, even pitiless,

realism, the Roman gentleman as he was.' Vernon Lee has pointed out that the secret of the beauty of these Graeco-Roman busts is also that of Renaissance portrait-sculpture, quite different in kind from the beauty of Greek ideal sculpture.

Nor is this realistic portraiture a new invention of the Augustan age. The Etruscan portrait-heads in terracotta, which date from the fourth and third centuries B.C., are both lifelike and individual, however inferior in workmanship. They were succeeded by a series of terracotta heads, of which many examples are to be found in

our museums, though often treated with undue neglect, in which a strain of Hellenistic idealism has crept in, without obscuring the Etruscan passion for truthfulness. It is probable, however, that most of the Etruscan work was in bronze, of which the statue in the opposite page,



## REALISM AND IDEALISM COMBINED

Even in the Augustan age the Etruscan tradition of accurate portraiture flowed strong beneath the surface current of Greek influence; as shown by this head of the young Augustus, idealised and delicately modelled but still individual.


*Vatican Museum, Rome; photo, Brugi*



#### TRUTH AND SINCERITY OF AN EARLY ITALIAN PORTRAIT

It is hard to say of the arresting bronze statue known as the Arringatore or Orator whether it is Roman or Etruscan. It was certainly found in Etruria and dates from about 200 B.C.; and in either case shows the splendid tradition of portrait statuary that lies behind Roman artistic achievement.




*Archaeological Museum, Florence; photo, Brogi*



BAND OF ROMAN KNIGHTS PORTRAYED IN NATIVE ROMAN STYLE

Would Roman art have developed worthily on independent lines without Greek influence? The question is answered by a unique alabastrine urn of the third or early second century B.C. At this date Greek influence had not made itself strongly felt, and Rome's only foreign tutor was Etruria; yet there is here none of the Etruscan stiffness. The scene is probably the procession of knights that annually commemorated the Battle of Lake Regillus.

*British Museum*



#### ARRESTING PORTRAITS OF NAMELESS ROMANS BY NAMELESS ARTISTS

Many of the portrait busts of Roman emperors are magnificent achievements; but they do not excel the work of Republican craftsmen, such as the four subjects above (one—top left—is of terra-cotta, once coloured). It is amazing that we do not know the names of any of these master sculptors.

*Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (top left), and Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen*



# VESSELS THAT ADORNED THE TABLES OF THE WEALTHY UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Pottery survives the ages; costly metals perish. Hence one is apt to forget that the art which the Attic potter had been content to lavish on humble clay was not quite lost under the Romans but transferred to gold and silver. These treasures of silver ware found at Bernay (top right) and Boscoreale, though 'precious,' are yet splendidly ornamental. The skeletons on the two goblets preach the doctrine, 'be merry, for to-morrow we die.'

*The Louvre and Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; photos, Graisdon*

the Arringatore already mentioned, is the finest example; it was, of course, in this material that they mainly excelled. But the terra-cotta heads exemplify the work of republican Rome in this direction during the third and second centuries B.C., and are well worthy of study even if not notable works of art.

The radical difference between Greek and Roman portraiture is worth noting. The Greek portrait sculptor aimed not so much at individuality as at reproducing a type, in accordance with the general tendency of Greek art. This distinction between the two races seems to have been a permanent one. The tendency has a further result: that in Roman sculpture the individuality of the artist forbids identification of his work, and there are no schools of sculptors as in Greek art, in which the creation of a type often enables us to recognize the artist.

The realism of Roman portraits is well exemplified at the beginning of the imperial age by the well known portraits of Julius Caesar and Augustus. But it is tempered by the idealistic training of the Greek artists who were mainly employed



ART TREASURE FROM THE THAMES

A bronze head of Hadrian, who we know paid a visit to Britain, was found in the Thames. It shows him bearded—he was the first emperor to affect a beard—and more like a Greek philosopher than a Roman Caesar.

*British Museum*



IDEAL PORTRAIT OF AUGUSTUS

The reigns of Augustus and Hadrian stand out as the periods when Greek influence was most active in Roman art. The quality is very marked in this really splendid bronze head of Augustus found as far afield as Meroë in Nubia.

*British Museum*

for such work, and whose task was to combine the realism with a faithful adherence to artistic principles. In this they may be said to have achieved decided success. The bust of Julius Caesar in the British Museum (see page 1780) shows, as has been said, 'the man as he lived, his features and expression rendered with the most unsparing realism; no detail softened if it could add to the individuality of the portrait. . . . If we contrast this face with those of Pericles and Alexander, we see the difference, not only between the men, but also in the art that portrayed them.' The head of the young Augustus in the Vatican shows more of the Greek spirit and of the delicacy of Greek modelling, but is still an accurate and precise rendering of nature. Another fine portrait of that emperor is the bronze head from the Sudan in the British Museum.

In the succeeding period, from Augustus to Vespasian, it is not in the imperial personages that we find the best specimens of the art—some indeed have been described as 'frankly vulgar'—but in the portraits of unknown persons. Under the



#### ANTONIA PORTRAYED AS A NYMPH

The so-called Clytie possibly represents Antonia (daughter of Mark Antony) in the guise of a nymph who was changed to a flower by Phoebus—thus illustrating the typical Roman device of identifying human with divine persons.

British Museum

Flavian emperors portraiture reaches its highest point, and the Greek artists show extraordinary skill in the combination of the Hellenic and Roman elements. Good examples are the two portraits of Titus, in the British Museum and the Vatican. Some of the private portraits, free from the formal conventionality of the Augustan age, produce the 'illusionist' effect characteristic of the period, representing a passing impression like a modern photograph.

It is also interesting, as illustrating the later progress of portraiture, to contrast the representations of Trajan and Hadrian (see pages 1964 and 1969). Trajan is the typical 'old Roman'; Hadrian is more cosmopolitan, 'the man of the world.' The latter was the first Roman emperor to adopt a beard, in which he was followed by most of his successors, and in Hadrian's case it has been thought to imply his Hellenic and philosophical sympathies. There is, moreover, in the portraits of Hadrian a distinctly Hellenic tendency towards the ideal and typical.

In the Antonine age Greek influence continued to be felt, but less strongly.

Technical skill devotes itself to accurate modelling, but at the expense of life and inspiration. Still we have one or two fine representations of Marcus Aurelius, especially (see page 1974) the famous equestrian statue on the Capitol, which aroused Michelangelo's admiration; and the portraits of the two Faustinas are fine and probably truthful pieces of work. The busts of Commodus (see page 1978) bring out most effectively the egotism and self-indulgence of that emperor, combined with a certain quality of beauty and strength. Still more realistic are the portraits of Caracalla (see page 2110), the most ferocious of all the Roman emperors, whose character is most effectively portrayed in busts in the Berlin Museum and elsewhere.

In the third century there is a distinct artistic improvement in the imperial portraits, and that of Decius roused the enthusiasm of Riegl, a great champion of later Roman art, who declares that it 'could not be called significant of artistic decay.' Best of all perhaps is the bust of Philippus Arabs in the Vatican (see page 2114), which, but for the unnatural treatment of the hair, is a finely rendered and characteristic piece of work. In fact, these busts show that the national gift for portraiture held its own when in other respects art was lapsing into the dulllest mediocrity.

A typical feature of imperial portraits is the representation of living personages in deified form or in semi-mythological guise. The famous Clytie in the British Museum is **Deified forms for the best-known example; living personages** it has been supposed to represent Antonia, the daughter of Marcus Antonius, in the character of a nymph who was beloved of Phoebus and was changed by him into a flower; but the combination of bust and flower here is probably purely decorative. The tendency to personification is another marked feature, whether of abstract ideas or localities; it is partly inherited from Hellenistic and Alexandrine art, partly the result of the Roman tendency to add abstract conceptions of all kinds to their pantheon of deities. The well known relief of the Apotheosis of Homer in the British

Museum (see page 1338) comprises two groups of such abstract conception, hardly characterised at all, and only recognizable by their names being inscribed above them.

The great impetus given to art under the Flavian emperors, which is exemplified in the portraits of the time, was due to the increased skill of the native Roman artist, who broke free from the conventions of the Augustan age and produced a new national art full of vigour and realism. During the century from Vespasian to Marcus Aurelius, Roman art was at its best, although it was not always manifested in the same way. Under the Flavian dynasty the artist's chief aim was an imitative naturalism which was intended to give an impression of real objects or persons, corresponding in principle, though not in method, to the aim of the impressionist artist of modern days. Under Trajan the historical monument or graphic record of actual events becomes prominent; while under Hadrian, with his cosmopolitan tastes and somewhat dilettante attitude towards art, it attained a more widespread popularity, even if it tended to reaction in the imitation and repetition of classical Greek types, and thus lacked originality and creative power.

The historical monument, though strictly a creation of the Flavian period, as we see in the Arch of Titus, was brought to its perfection under Trajan, in whose time it became, whether in the form of the arch, column or relief, the usual method of commemorating important events. From an artistic point of view, indeed, it sins against many of the canons of true art, ignoring as it does limitations of material and technique, and often exhibiting a lack of decorative instinct. It is rather for their subject than for their artistic merit that we value such monuments, as illustrating the national preference for historic sculpture, and preserving a pictorial record of the great events of the time.

These monuments were made the subject of a very stimulating study by F. Wickhoff, a German artist and art critic, whose chief merit it is that he approached the subject from a purely

aesthetic point of view, without any archaeological prepossessions. That his conclusions were therefore entirely correct does not, of course, follow; but they are a valuable reminder that the artist often sees what the antiquary ignores.

This writer claims that Roman art in its later phases introduced a new method of telling a story—that of the 'continuous narrative,' or representation of several episodes of the subject as taking place simultaneously. Greek art, he says, knew only two methods of telling a story, the 'isolating' and the 'complementary.' The latter aimed at the expression of everything which concerned the main subject, without necessarily repeating the same figures, but all united in one space without regard to time. The isolating method is well illustrated by the Greek vases of the end of the sixth century representing the labours of Theseus as single isolated events collected together; while the complementary method may be seen in the Troilus episodes on the François vase at Florence (see page 1041), dating from fifty years earlier.

The continuous method is not, however, wholly new or purely Roman. It is indeed an invariable feature of barbaric and early art, and possibly that is why it appealed to the Romans, whose artistic perceptions were weaker than those of the Greeks. This may also well explain why the early Christians took so readily to this method. It should rather be said that Roman artists of the time of Trajan were the first to introduce a method of telling a story in which successive actions were represented as taking place simultaneously, the same personages being depicted as taking part in some or all at one time. This is the method regularly adopted in early Christian art.

Another of Wickhoff's theories is that the monuments of the post-Augustan period illustrate an entirely new principle, which he terms 'illusionism,' and which, as we have already noted, corresponds in some degree to modern 'impressionism.' The aim of the Roman artist is to treat his figures without regard to their architectural surroundings, just as the modern



painter manipulates patches of colour with the object of producing a certain optical result for the spectator. It is indeed a principle derived from pictorial art, as we shall see in considering the Pompeian paintings.

In the Arch of Titus, where the sacred vessels captured from the Temple at Jerusalem are represented as being carried in a triumphal procession (see page 1958), we are intended to look at a picture of the procession marching past, through an open frame. This result is obtained by working the back row of figures in flat relief on the background, so that they cast no shadow. 'Beauty of line, symmetry of parts, such as a conventional art demands, are no longer sought for; everything is concentrated on the one aim of producing an impression of continuous motion.' It was, in fact, a discovery by sculpture of a third dimension; though, as another critic has pointed out, it was an achievement of doubtful merit, the flatter treatment of the art of Trajan's time being better suited to architectural decoration.

The reign of Trajan marks the culmination of the historical monument. We have

not only the great column in the emperor's Forum, but also his arch at Beneventum in southern Italy, and the series of reliefs from the Forum which Constantine the Great afterwards took to decorate his triumphal arch. The latter are claimed by Wickhoff as an example of the continuous style, and have been described as 'an epic in stone, yet highly dramatic.' They represent the victories and triumphs of the emperor, all crowded into a narrow space, in which 'extreme naturalness of movement is combined with an ideal treatment of time,' an artistic device to produce the impression of an unbroken series of events passing before the spectator.

In the arch at Beneventum, on the other hand, the decoration recalls the arch of Titus; it combines, however, the isolating with the continuous style, the scenes being linked together by the presence of the principal personage in each. The subjects depicted illustrate on the one side the emperor's domestic policy, on the other his foreign or colonial relations. Illusionism, according to Wickhoff, is called upon to give the impression of crowding.



#### MASTERLY ILLUSION OF A MULTITUDE ON TRAJAN'S ARCH AT BENEVENTUM

The great triumphal arch erected in honour of Trajan at Beneventum can scarcely have been completed before his death, since this befell, in A.D. 117, during his return from the Parthian expedition, on which he is depicted as setting out in the panel above. The scene is one of sacrifice, and all the other scenes represent isolated incidents; but the emperor appears as the central figure throughout—a combination of the 'isolating' and 'continuous' styles of monumental record.

*Photo, Atinari*



#### SPIRITED RENDERING OF A ROMAN VICTORY

Constantine's artistic conscience belies his title 'the Great.' Most of the sculptures of his arch at Rome were stolen from other monuments, the most interesting being those that commemorated the victories of Trajan, in the 'continuous' style. He is here seen charging over a Dacian battlefield.

*Photo, Anderson*

The column of Trajan is a striking example of the continuous method. We note the prominence given to the emperor, who appears in the centre of every part of the composition as we follow the spiral series of reliefs winding up from the base to the top. In all, his figure appears ninety times, and yet the repetition, as Wickhoff says, is far from wearisome. It means that all the interest of each scene is subordinated to that of his person, which everywhere dominates the action; and to quote the same writer again, 'though the method of constant repetition may seem to break up artistic unity . . . the spectator carries away the impression that he has really been through the campaign at the emperor's side. It is the continuous method of representation which alone can arouse this feeling.'


The various scenes comprise not only every kind of military incident, but also the triumphal celebrations which followed. They are, in fact, a pictorial chronicle in stone, rather than artistic compositions. At the same time the decoration is admirably

adapted to the form of the monument, the adoption of the spiral principle having contributed to this result. We are also struck by the wonderful variety in the treatment of the scenes even when the same action is repeated, and by the felicitous details of the background, whether landscape or architecture.

The reign of Hadrian brought a reaction in the direction of classicism and eclecticism. We have already noted the emperor's cosmopolitan and intellectual sympathies, which explain the revival of a Greek tendency in art, to which also are due the many copies and imitations of Greek works which may be assigned to

this period. But that creative art had not therefore ceased is shown by the representations of Antinous, the emperor's favourite, whose cult was such a notable feature of his reign, and gave a definite impulse to the art of sculpture with its combination of the ideal and the individual type.

Another striking feature of the art of Hadrian's reign is to be found in the



#### THE SPLENDID ARTISTRY OF TRAJAN'S COLUMN

The best extant model of 'continuous' sculpture is the Column of Trajan at Rome. The spiral band that mounts its 97-foot shaft shows incident after incident of the Dacian campaign, giving the impression of an unbroken story. Here Father Danube blesses the Roman army crossing by a bridge of boats.

*Photo, Alinari*



#### HANDSOME FAVOURITE OF HADRIAN

Hadrian was strongly Greek in his tastes, which explains the classic revival of his reign; as seen especially in the many representations of his favourite Antinous. These combine an ideal Greek type with Roman characterisation.

*Villa Albani, Rome*

sarcophagi with reliefs, which, though not a new feature of Roman art, now acquired increasing popularity. The ornamental sarcophagus was, as we have already seen, a great feature of Etruscan art, and was never popularised in Greece. The earlier Roman examples are seldom ornamented with any but decorative motives, such as festoons, but in the second century they came to be sculptured both on front and sides with mythological subjects, largely conventionalised from original Greek compositions. They are mostly good examples of the continuous style, for which the elongated surfaces of their fronts were well adapted, and the execution varies from a fairly high level of merit to a degenerate and careless grouping of crowded figures. They never really rise above the level of good decorative work, but have their value as mythological if not as artistic monuments.

In some we see a revival of the classicist style of the Augustan age, as in a well known example from the Villa Albani at Rome, representing the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis. Another type is well represented by the sarcophagus with

Achilles in Scyros in the Capitoline Museum; but in this the tendency to a mechanical and crowded method of composition is apparent, and we feel that sculpture is nearing the point of exhaustion. A third variety, which perhaps traces its ancestry to the fourth-century Greek sarcophagi from Sidon, has an arrangement of columns along the front with single figures or groups between them. Of this we shall shortly have to consider a striking late development.

Returning to the age of the Antonines, which carries on the combination of the continuous method with classical eclecticism, we find little work of outstanding merit, although some writers, like Professor Dill, regard it as 'an age of splendid public spirit and great material achievement.' The masterpiece of this period is the column of Marcus Aurelius, which, though not so impressive, may be compared with that of Trajan as an example of the continuous style.

The history of sculpture during the third century of the Empire is, on the whole, a record of steady degeneration, only relieved by some excellent examples of portraiture, and by the sculptures on the arches of Septimius Severus and Constantine the Great.

There is, indeed, an **Gradual degeneration**  
entire departure from **of Roman sculpture**  
Roman methods and  
principles, in the introduction of the frontality which is such a marked feature of the sculpture of Constantine's time; and its rigidity and squareness is the forerunner of the Byzantine mosaics.

We can hardly accept the enthusiastic championship of Riegl, who regards the art of this period as a development along the ascending line. As Professor Stuart-Jones has pointed out, 'Riegl is right in his endeavour to trace the definite artistic intention of each period, and to prove that the transformation of art is not decadence but a search for new paths,' but the artistic products of third and fourth century Rome absolutely forbid an unqualified acceptance of these views.

Another great champion of the art of this period, though proceeding on very different lines, is Professor Strzygowski, who, again, has been led astray by his

enthusiasm for the art of the Eastern world, which, as he rightly maintains, is the heir of the Greek tradition. In tracing the origin of Christian art, which he regards as a direct continuation of Hellenic art in the East, untouched by Western influences, he denies to Rome her due share. It must be remembered that his theories are only of limited application, and do not really affect what we regard as Roman art. Just as in Gaul and elsewhere, so in Asia Minor and Syria, there were local and independent schools, and Strzygowski's real merit is to have discovered the artistic capacities of the East.

We also owe to him a debt of gratitude for bringing into notice a group of sarcophagi, of about the third or fourth century, from Asia Minor, which display remarkable merit and originality. They present such marked differences from the

purely Roman sarcophagi that they must obviously be the work of a local school, trained under other influences. The main principle of their decoration is that of a colonnade composed of columns supporting flat arches or pediments, below which are shallow niches, often with shell-shaped heads, in which are figures. These are usually deities or figures of the deceased persons and their families; but we also find such singularly inappropriate themes as hunting scenes, unintelligently combined with an architectural background. As a French critic aptly puts it: 'We do not hunt in the Rue de Rivoli!' The colonnade scheme is, as we have already seen, derived from Greek sarcophagi, and though not unknown at Rome, never found favour there.

Taken by themselves the figures are of remarkable artistic merit. More than one




#### HOW ROMAN SCULPTORS SYMBOLISED A FORTUNATE RAINSTORM

The period of the Antonine emperors yields nothing finer than the column of Marcus Aurelius, on which the miracle of the rain, attributed in Christian tradition to the prayers of the 'Thundering' Legion, is represented from a pagan standpoint. The execution is not nearly so good as the continuous reliefs from the time of Trajan, but the conception of the rain god shows originality.

Compare, also, the reliefs from the base of the Antonine Column in page 1902.


*Photo, Anderson*



#### QUALITIES AND DEFECTS OF ROMAN FUNERARY ART

It was in the time of Hadrian that the practice of adorning sarcophagi with mythological figures in relief became popular, somewhat in the manner of the old Etruscan caskets; in the interval their decoration had been mainly conventional. Some of them are really fine pieces of work: this, for example, showing Achilles discovered among the daughters of Lycomedes in Scyros. But here there is a tendency towards that overcrowding which later became one of their chief defects.

*Capitoline Museum, Rome: photo, Alinari*



#### LATE FLOWERING OF ROMAN ART ON EASTERN SARCOPHAGI

An interesting group of sarcophagi is found almost exclusively in Asia Minor. They date from the third or fourth century, and present their reliefs—deities, or the deceased, or sometimes, inappropriately enough, hunting scenes—in an architectural setting, between pillars. The idea is Hellenistic and finds parallels in the Pompeian wall paintings. Altogether, in spite of their artificiality, they compare very favourably with the western types of sarcophagus.

*Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen: photo, Mansell*

appear at first sight to be good Greek work, recalling the style of Praxiteles. Other critics have compared them with Donatello. With their effective contrasts of light and shade they compare favourably with their backgrounds of acanthus patterns which are worked with the drill and not the chisel. Essentially Greek as these conceptions are, however, we cannot ignore that they have an unmistakable suggestion of the setting of the stage, and the later Pompeian wall paintings, which reproduce the same effect, are a clue to their true origin.

One interesting feature of these sarcophagi is their connexion with Christian art. There is actually one at Berlin with a figure of Christ, which may be compared with an ivory diptych with S. Michael in the British Museum, and the same method of decoration may be seen in Maximian's throne at Ravenna. Thus for a long time Christianity kept alive the flame of pagan art.

This study of Roman art is necessarily in the main occupied with its two chief manifestations, in architecture and sculpture. But our survey would not be complete without a glance at the other provinces in which Roman art achieved a considerable measure of success. They equally serve to illustrate its capabilities.

Taking first the consideration of Roman painting, we at once find ourselves in an advantageous position, as compared with what we know of Greek efforts in this branch of art. While of the latter we have practically no remains, at any rate no masterpieces from the great artists, of Roman painting, we have at Pompeii and in Rome a considerable amount of material. Roman paintings fall into two categories: wall paintings or frescoes, and easel paintings or pictures. The process mainly employed for the latter involved the use of tempera or distemper, although ancient writers frequently mention another, known



CHRISTIAN SUBJECT IN ROMAN ART

It was undoubtedly sarcophagi of the eastern type shown in the opposite page that gave rise to a fine series of Christian burial caskets. As far as the art is concerned we should scarcely know that they were Christian; but on some, such as that above, the figure of Christ actually appears.

*Berlin Museum*

as encaustic, in which hot wax was employed as a vehicle laid on with a tool known as a 'cestrum.' It is, however, probable that this process was chiefly confined to Egypt, and in recent years a large number of painted portraits have been found in that part of the world, some of which may have been executed by this method on panels of wood.

But for our knowledge of Roman painting in general we are chiefly indebted to the excavations at Pompeii, and in a lesser degree to paintings found in Rome itself and the neighbourhood. The majority of the paintings in Rome take the form of landscapes, a branch of art in which the Greeks seem to have been even more backward than the old Italian masters. But the Greeks did not care in the least about landscape, and indeed the medieval painters merely regarded it as an effective background for their figure subjects. On the other hand, in


the Roman paintings of the Augustan age landscape is often the main theme of the picture, and moreover shows by its truthfulness an appreciation of nature which was quite foreign to Greek taste.

We read in Latin writers of one *Studius* (or *Ludius*) and other painters who introduced a new style of painting in which villas, gardens or harbours were represented; though even in these the real interest of the picture was in the human figures, engaged in various activities, that were depicted in the foreground. They were in fact analogous to the Dutch 'interiors.' Pictures of this



type have been found at Pompeii, painted in what Wickhoff called the 'illusionist' or impressionist manner. An even better example, which might well have been the work of *Ludius* just mentioned, was found in the villa of *Livia* at *Prima Porta* outside Rome, representing a fruit garden. Though the detail is admirable and the colouring effective, it is rather an example of decorative than of creative art.

The finest examples of landscape painting which have come down to us are the *Odyssey* landscapes found on the *Esquiline* at Rome and now in the Vatican library. They date



#### ROMAN MUMMY PORTRAITS PRESERVED BY THE DRY ATMOSPHERE OF EGYPT

From very early times it had been the practice in Egypt to adorn the mummy casket with a human mask (compare page 705); and under Roman domination the Græco-Roman residents who adopted the Egyptian mode of burial followed the same custom, the portraits being painted either on the wooden casket or on a wooden panel included in the mummy-wrappings. By local artists they yet suggest the possibilities of Roman portrait painting at its best.


*British School of Archaeology in Egypt, Ny Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen, and National Gallery, London*

from about the beginning of the Christian era, and the subjects are taken from the wanderings of Ulysses described in the tenth and eleventh books of the *Odyssey*. Here the landscape distinctly predominates over the figures, in spite of the interest of the subjects; the style is distinctly impressionist. Two paintings in the British Museum, one of Ulysses passing the Sirens, the other of the fatal flight of Icarus, are of similar style.

There are also two admirable examples of Roman painting of this time in the House of Livia on the Palatine, one representing Polyphemus courting the nymph Galatea, the other Hermes delivering Io from Argus. Similar subjects are found at Pompeii, but the Roman examples are certainly superior in con-

ception and execution. An even finer work is the 'Aldobrandini marriage' in the Vatican, which represents a bride preparing for the nuptial procession. In its delicate grace and disregard of realism a great authority sees a reflection of the characteristics of Greek fourth-century masterpieces, though the picture itself is *not older than the first century B.C.*

At Pompeii the employment of mural painted decoration was almost universal and we are fortunate in the circumstances that have led to so much being preserved. The Pompeian styles of painting have been divided into four successive periods, extending from the Hellenistic age down to the destruction of the town. The 'incrustation' style of the first period is so called as being an imitation of the



#### DECORATIVE RENDERING OF ROMAN ORCHARD AND PLEASANCE

Roman wall paintings are chiefly represented for us by those of Pompeii (see page 1937); but it must be remembered that these are in a sense Greek rather than Roman. At Rome itself, however, there is the splendid example from the villa of Livia at Prima Porta. It shows a fruit garden, with lawn, flower beds and birds, both caged and free; the whole treated, nevertheless, in a decorative rather than a 'landscape' manner. It is botanically accurate, most of the plants being identifiable.

*From 'Antike Denkmäler.'*





EXQUISITE FRESCO PAINTING FOUND IN ROME ITSELF: THE SO-CALLED ALLOBRANDINI MARRIAGE

In the fresco known as the Allobrandini Marriage we have Roman painting at its best. Some see in it a copy of a fourth-century Greek masterpiece: and without doubt its composition and obvious allegory—with Hymen sitting by the nuptial couch and goddesses about the waiting bride—are Greek in spirit. But more probably it is an original expression of a still living art: Roman, or, if we prefer the term, Hellenistic.

*Vatican Library; photo, Anderson*

fashion of inlaying with slabs of coloured marble ('*crustae*'), the panels of the walls being painted in plain ground colours. The next stage is known as the 'architectural,' in which pictures are introduced in an architectural setting which acts as a framework, and produces a sort of illusory perspective. The third, or 'ornate,' style retains the architectural setting, but in a quite subordinate position. Lastly, the 'intricate' style, which lasted from about A.D. 50 down to 79, and to which most of the existing paintings belong, shows the complete evolution of the 'illusionism' of the Flavian period.

The subjects of the Pompeian paintings fall under four headings: mythological, 'genre' (i.e. representing scenes from everyday life), landscape and still life. The majority belonging to the first class. The mythological subjects were usually selected for their dramatic or psychological interest, such as the subjects from the Tale of Troy in the house of Castor and Pollux, or for the expression of emotion, as in the painting of the sacrifice of Iphigencia in the house of the Tragic Poet. Others were merely reduced to studies of human figures and landscapes, or degenerate into more or less idyllic love scenes. Many of them, however, are doubtless copies or reflections of famous Greek originals, such as the Medea slaying her children, found at Herculaneum, or the infant Hercules strangling the serpents in the House of the Vettii, based on a masterpiece by Zeuxis. The transformation of mythology into genre is well illustrated by a series of paintings in the last-named house, representing Cupids engaged in various occupations of daily life, such as making and selling oil or wine or acting as goldsmiths or fullers.

An interesting study of the Pompeian paintings was made some years ago by Wickhoff, in connexion with his theories already discussed under the heading of sculpture. He deals principally with the prevalence of 'illusionism,' which we should naturally expect to be more in evidence in painting than in sculpture, though, as we have seen, he is probably wrong in maintaining that it makes its first appearance in the Flavian epoch,

that is, only in the last stages of Pompeian painting. As a matter of fact, Pompeii was a centre of Greek rather than Roman civilization, and the Pompeian artists were influenced in a great degree by the Alexandrine schools of art in the Hellenistic age. The value of their achievements for us is not so much to enable us to understand Roman art as to reconstruct in some small degree the little we shall probably ever know about Greek painting.

It is a curious fact that the destruction of Pompeii seems to have synchronised with the almost complete disappearance of

the art of painting in the Roman world. Its place was taken by a new method of decoration, that of mosaic, which in spite of its obvious limitations yet proved a very effective form of graphic art. Originally practised in the East, it was introduced first into Italy about the middle of the second century B.C., and was used both for floors and for wall decoration. Subsequently it spread to the provinces, and some of the finest achievements in this direction during the Empire are to be found in the pavements of houses in Gaul, Germany and Britain.



#### EXTRAORDINARY FRESCO IN THE 'INTRICATE' STYLE FROM POMPEII

The fresco paintings at Pompeii are more Greek than the Aldobrandini Marriage; and one feels surprise that the latter is decidedly superior. They fall into successive periods, of which an example of the fourth, or 'intricate,' from the House of the Vettii is given above. In this every device of 'illusionism' is employed, the architectural setting being often designed to give a sense of vanishing perspective. The dado, however, imitates marble in the first or 'incrustation' style.

*Photo, Illeggi*



#### POMPEIAN COPY OF A GREEK WORK

Of the subjects selected by the Pompeian wall decorators the mythological are the most numerous. An excellent example is the Sacrifice of Iphigenia in the House of the Tragic Poet. Chosen for its pathos, it may be a copy of a picture by Timanthes (c. 400 B.C.), of which a description survives.

*National Museum, Naples; photo, Brogi*

The earlier mosaics in Italy show the influence of Alexandrine art, such as the great mosaic from Palestrina at Naples, representing an Egyptian landscape at the time of an inundation of the Nile (see page 1844). Another fine example of the Republican period is the marvellously pictorial mosaic in the House of the Faun at Pompeii representing Alexander the Great and Darius at the Battle of the Issus, a copy of a Greek work of two hundred years earlier (page 1436). As a tour de force in an unpromising material, it is a marvel of spirited dramatic composition, which rightly evoked the admiration of Goethe. The later mosaics, for the best examples of which we have to go to the provincial remains in central Europe and North Africa, are more definitely Roman in spirit as well as in theme, but they all bear the stamp of the general artistic decadence which set in during the latter days of the Roman Empire. We must, however, bear in

mind that this was one of the few arts which survived the spread of Christianity in the Empire, and that we owe to Roman inspiration the splendid decoration of many early Western and Byzantine churches.

Another branch of art in which the Romans achieved real success was that of gem engraving. The earliest Roman gems, as we have already seen, are among our few sources of information for the development of native art under the Republic. In these, two streams of influences, native and foreign, at first distinct, gradually unite until the victory of the foreign results in a complete disappearance of individuality. This, however, is only true of the engraved gems or intaglios. Another branch of the art, namely cameo-cutting, which had been somewhat tentatively practised by the Greeks of the Hellenistic age, was more successful in its appeal

both to the Roman artist and to the Roman public.

In the Augustan age it reached the height of its popularity; not only was it employed for portraits of popular imperial personages, but its use was extended to the production of historical or quasi-historical subjects, in imitation of such works in sculpture as the Ara Pacis. One of the finest examples of the latter is the Gemma Augustea in Vienna, measuring about 8½ by 7½ inches, and representing the deification of Augustus (see page 1848). Still larger, though an inferior piece of work, is the similar cameo in the Cabinet des Médailles at Paris (see page 1850), measuring about 12 by 10 inches. It is, as Mrs. Strong points out, peculiarly Roman in treatment, whereas the Vienna cameo is more in the Hellenic manner. Another famous cameo is the British Museum portrait of Augustus, which has been attributed (as has also the Vienna cameo) to the great gem-engraver of the

period, Dioscorides. But the popularity of the cameo was brief, and by the end of the first century the art had sunk to the same level as the gem engraving.

Artistic metal-working also received a great impetus in the Augustan age, when Roman decorative art was at its height. Chasing in gold and silver had been practised with great success, especially

in Asia Minor in the fourth century B.C., and doubtless the general looting of the art treasures of the East in the campaigns of Mummius and Sulla flooded Rome with metal masterpieces, which were not only prized but largely imitated. The general increase of luxury in the later days of the Republic further assisted the development of this industry, which, as will be seen,



#### HOW THE HOUSE WALLS OF WEALTHY ROMANS WERE ADORNED

Many Pompeian paintings are 'genre': and a transition to these from the mythological subjects is probably afforded by a group in the House of the Vettii showing Cupids at various trades. In this strip (bottom) they are acting as fullers. Above them is a beautifully natural study of a flute player, also from Pompeii, and a rendering of Medea before the slaying of her children, found at Herculaneum. The latter may be a copy of a work by Timomachus (first century A.C.).

*British Museum (photo. Mansell); National Museum, Naples, and Pompeii (photo. Drogli)*



#### SKILFUL PICTORIAL USE OF MOSAIC

Mosaic work was introduced to the Roman world from the East, and was employed with great felicity in Africa. This head of Summer is part of a composition representing the various months and seasons found at Carthage, dating from about A.D. 250.

*British Museum*

exercised a powerful influence on other branches of decorative art, such as terra-cotta work and pottery. But, like that of cameo cutting, its popularity was short-lived.

The chief products of the Roman metal workers are in silver, and we are fortunate in possessing several remarkable 'treasures,' or collections of plate belonging to wealthy Romans of the time of Augustus, besides single specimens. The most splendid of these is the Boscoreale treasure found near Pompeii and now mostly in the Louvre, while Berlin can boast the Hildesheim treasure and Paris that of Bernay. The Boscoreale treasure



#### MASTERPIECE OF A CAMEO CUTTER

The promise of originality in the earlier Roman gems (page 1913) bore fruit in the making of cameos. This head of Augustus is a genuine masterpiece; compare also those in pages 1848 and 1850.

*British Museum*

can be dated earlier than A.D. 79, as the site was overwhelmed by the eruption of that year, and is in fact earlier in style.

The vessels are mostly table-ware, in the form of drinking-cups, bowls and jugs, but intended for ornament rather than use. The bowls are usually decorated with designs in high relief; the jugs have subjects in the 'classical' style of the Augustan period; and of the cups the two finest have reliefs relating to the glorification of Augustus and Tiberius. They fall in line with the large cameos just described. Though Alexandrine influence is strongly at work, it is not the only influence, and some of the pieces actually bear the names of local artists. They illustrate, in fact, the tendency of the period to follow certain decorative principles

with little or no regard to the material employed. The work indeed is not creative art, and it therefore leaves no strong impression, but it does show the remarkable and highly developed decorative instincts of the Roman artists at this time.

The same tendency is at work in the terra-cotta mural reliefs and the pottery of the period; in them the same decorative motives are reproduced over and over again, as in the metal work, in many cases owing their origin to earlier Greek work, but treated with a sense of composition and appropriateness to their material which redeems them from

dullness. The terra-cotta reliefs were applied to the decoration of Roman houses and villas, and the subjects were either mythological or purely decorative. Cicero speaks of using them to decorate his house. The style is usually 'new-Attic' (see page 1919). The pottery which we have mentioned was made almost exclusively at Arretium (Arezzo) in Tuscany, and the vases, made in a highly glazed red clay, are close imitations of metal work. They often bear the names of their Roman makers, of whom the chief were M. Perennius and P. Cornelius. It is an



#### HOW ARRETINE WARE WAS MADE

In the contemporary pottery called 'Arretine,' imitated largely from the metal work (see below) to suit slenderer purses, the same tendencies are apparent. Thus, the krater (top right) is pleasingly refined; but the terra-cotta mould (lower right), with the modern impression from it, lets one into the secret of its 'mass' production.

*British Museum*

interesting commentary on the different conditions of culture in Greece and Italy that the Greeks were content with clay vessels for ordinary purposes, and that their artists found it worth their while to lavish their best efforts on their painted decoration; while the more luxurious Romans were content with nothing less than precious metal, and those in humble circumstances had to be content with clay imitations.



#### SILVER WARE OF A SUMPTUOUS AGE

The Augustan age was the great period of metal working, principally in silver. As shown by the ornamental bowl from Hildesheim on the right, with Athena in high relief, the results were magnificently decorative but had little originality. Of the two vessels on the left, that above is also from Hildesheim, while the second belongs to the find at Boscoreale, of which other examples appear in page 1924.

*Photos, Giraudon*



# JERUSALEM AS IT APPEARS TO-DAY AFTER THREE THOUSAND YEARS OF CHEQUERED HISTORY

Since about 1000 B.C., when David subdued the Jebusites and made their fortified town his capital city, Jerusalem has had an extraordinarily chequered and romantic history, as Jewry's national centre, as shrine of Christendom, as victim of Ottoman domination. A new chapter in its long story began with its surrender to the British in 1917, since when a revival of Jewish national spirit in its ancient home has been in progress. This view is of S. Stephen's Gate and Bezetha, the north-east end of the city, with the supposed Garden of Gethsemane in the left foreground and Mizpeh in the far distance.

Photo, F. M. Good

# THE FALL OF JERUSALEM AND ITS WORLD SIGNIFICANCE

Tracing the Rise of Judaism after the Exile and the Effect of the Destruction of the City by Titus

By W. A. L. ELMSLIE D.D.

Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature in Westminster College and late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge; Author of *Studies in Life from Jewish Proverbs, etc.*

THE period considered in this chapter opens, not with the capture of Jerusalem by the Roman army commanded by Titus in A.D. 70, but with the equally famous destruction of the city by the Babylonians in 586 B.C. That its fall in A.D. 70 may be regarded as a landmark in history is not due to the military importance of the event. Jerusalem was never one of the strategic centres of the Graeco-Roman civilization. At the beginning and at the close of our period this provincial city lies in ruins, and during the intervening six centuries its actions never seriously affected the rise and fall of the great empires. It was but a pawn in the politics of the Powers, and yet its affairs are of the first importance for the history of mankind.

The civilization of Europe is in the main the result of three formative influences: the system of the Romans, the artistic and intellectual genius of the Greeks, and thirdly those ideas and ideals which were the product of the Jews in this period and which were perpetuated in part directly by the continuance of the Jewish race, in part through the specific development they underwent in the Christian Church. Since therefore these immensely powerful beliefs were fashioned in the fires of the fortunes of Jerusalem, the historian must needs pay close attention to details that would otherwise be insignificant. It is as if a writer in (say) A.D. 3000 were to declare that the destinies of the Eastern Hemisphere had been determined not solely by the actions of the Great Powers of to-day, nor by the uprise of Eastern nationalism, but also by ideas tenaciously maintained by the inhabitants of Montenegro.

It should be noted also that the period in question (586 B.C. to A.D. 70) has curious importance in relation to our own times of transition and cosmopolitan problems. Thus, the sixth century B.C. is now known to have been one of the remarkable centuries in history, an age of intense mental and religious activity and of social upheaval. In the Near East it saw control pass for ever from the very ancient Egypto-Semitic empires into the hands of Aryan peoples, the Persians, Greeks and Romans—with Palestine as the very centre of interest, in that while the culture of Babylonia died, and Egypt was profoundly modified, here alone through the survival of the Jewish people was *Continuity between a real continuity main- Old World and New* tained between the 'old' and the 'new' worlds. And of course the first century A.D.—with the persistence of Judaism and the rise of Christianity amidst the cosmopolitan unity and variety of the Roman Empire—is of unending historical significance. Our task, therefore, is not so much to discuss the history of the Jews as to outline the rise of Judaism.

It has been said above that alike at the beginning of the period under discussion and at its close in A.D. 70 Jerusalem lay in ruins; it would be more to the point to say that our study begins and ends with a psychological marvel—the survival by the Jews of two seemingly irretrievable disasters. We begin with the first of these.

The pre-exilic Kingdom of Judah came to an end when the Babylonian army having twice captured Jerusalem, in 597 and again in 586 B.C., deported to Babylonia a great number of its principal



inhabitants. At the latter date the Jewish resistance was utterly broken, the Temple burnt, and such colossal breaches made in the walls that the city was left defenceless. Fifty years later the Chaldaeo-Babylonian Empire itself collapsed before the onset of the Medes and Persians under Cyrus; but fifty years would have been long enough for the exiles, and for the shattered remnants in Palestine, to have lost national coherence, had it not been for their response to the power and insight of the teaching given by certain great personalities in their midst.

The canonical Jewish account of this period, given in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, is unsatisfactory. Its author,

who was also the compiler of the Books of Canonical Chronicles, are misleading

Chronicles, and lived in Jerusalem about 300 B.C., dismisses the Exilic years in a single verse; his knowledge of the early Persian period is fragmentary and confused; nor is he reliable even for the events of a hundred years later, Nehemiah's time. And in general his view of the restoration of the Jewish fortunes is so dominated by a special theory as to be seriously misleading. His ideas, however, must be outlined, if only for the light that is shed thereby on the author himself—an ardent Jew, with priestly interests, living about the end of the Persian Empire at the time when the quarrel with the Samaritans had become irreconcilable.

The Chronicler supposed that the Babylonian army swept into exile the entire worth, intellectual and moral, of the Judaeen Kingdom, and that not only was Judah denuded of its population but that the few who remained, mixing with other Palestinian folk (all of whom, including the inhabitants of the Samaritan area, he regarded as virtually pagan), became so forgetful of Jehovah, so apostate and heathenish, as to be thereafter religiously worthless. The 'blue blood' of Jewish life and faith maintained its purity in Babylonia. Thence, the sins of their forefathers purged away in the sufferings and shame of the Exile, and themselves enlightened by its discipline, a vast company of loyal exiles (some 50,000) returned with the permission of Cyrus, the Persian con-

queror of Babylon, in 539 B.C., to the desolate Zion.

Their godly wish at once to restore the Temple was, however, frustrated through the unpardonable jealousy of their 'adversaries,' the people of the land. Not until 516 B.C. could that pious endeavour be achieved, and not until seventy years later, under the heroic Nehemiah and in face of the malign but this time futile opposition of the Samaritans, were the city walls rebuilt and the loyal Jewish community safely established. About the same time its strength was augmented by the advent of a second splendid company of returning exiles from Babylonia, led by a champion of orthodoxy, Ezra the Scribe, who instructed the people in the perfect Law of Moses and won them to adopt it enthusiastically as the constitution of the renewed Jewish State.

Such is the tone of the Chronicler's account. It is by no means devoid of truth, although it is radically unjust to the non-exilic 'people of the land.' Fortunately, its doctrinaire bias can be corrected, its artificialities discounted, its confusions considerably straightened out, and its omissions filled in from other sources. Many problems remain, complex and obscure, and the total information is meagre; but it is possible to present the history in truer perspective.

We have to rid ourselves of the notion of an almost depopulated Judah. The mass of the country folk remained, and even Jerusalem was not entirely deserted, while the districts to the north (Samaria) **Judah not depopulated** probably suffered little in invasions which had been directed by the Babylonians against the strategic menace of Jerusalem. The Kingdom was gone, and with it Zion's religious predominance; but the rural population probably benefited by the removal of the political storm centre.

We have next to note that a shifting and increase of population took place in Judah. Urged northwards by pressure from Arab tribes farther south, there was an incursion of semi-nomadic people into southern Judah, and clans and families of Edomite and semi-Edomite blood moved upwards from the south of Judah towards Jerusalem. Close kinsfolk of the older

Judaean families, some at least of these clans were not without their own memories of tribal history and of the God Jehovah; and their ideas may have affected very intricately the re-shaping of Hebrew literary traditions in the post-exilic age.

Thirdly, it would seem probable that the relations between the changing Judaean and the Samaritan districts were increasingly friendly, so that the land tended towards unity. Moreover, the population as a whole was more loyally Hebraic or Jewish in its attitude to Jehovah than the Chronicler's scanty information and late orthodox standpoint enabled him to suppose. Jeremiah and Ezekiel both look hopefully on Ephraim (Samaria) as truly a part of Jehovah's people, and the ancient sanctuary of Bethel may well have played an important rôle after the fall of Jerusalem in nurturing faith in Jehovah and preserving the teaching of the great prophets. Some such conclusion indeed seems necessary in view of the fact that, as the quarrel between the Jews and Samaritans developed, the latter, so far from tending to laxness in their worship, accepted the observance of the entire Mosaic code with even more meticulous zeal than the Jews themselves.

For the countryside, then, the fall of the state and the incursion of new settlers were not unmitigated evils. Remember-

ing that the hills of Judah had once produced a **Apathy of the Palestinian Jews** David and an Amos, who can say that the situation

was hopeless nationally or religiously? But there were also darker features in the scene; and—to sum up—when the actual facts of the revival after 539 B.C. are closely studied, it seems clear there was a certain impotence in the Palestinian Jews, and that while this native population presented material on which ardent minds could work, the indispensable impulse came from elsewhere. Had those left in Palestine been the only Jews, it seems in the last degree improbable that Judaism would ever have been created.

Whence then came the galvanic impulse? Not from the Jews in Egypt, even though they may have been numerous before 586 B.C., and though a large body fled thither soon after 586 B.C., carrying

Jeremiah with them. Jeremiah is quite explicit on the religious degeneracy of these fugitives, and although centuries afterwards the huge Jewish colony in Egypt was magnificently loyal to its ancient land and faith, that was due to the advent of subsequent immigrants who came from Palestine imbued with the very Judaism the creation of which we are considering. Certain interesting Aramaic papyri have revealed that even as late as 408 B.C. a long established Jewish colony at Elephantine on the Nile in southern Egypt, which was confidently asking help from the civil and religious authorities in Palestine, seems to have apportioned its temple funds between Jehovah and two female deities, apparently consort goddesses! Not from Egypt came the marvel of the Jewish revival.

Our attention concentrates, therefore, on the third possible source—the exiles taken to Babylonia in 597 and 586 B.C.: and they repay attention. For it was here **Babylonia source** that those beliefs were **of Jewish revival** grasped, and that system

of worship initiated, which was not only to save the race-consciousness of the Jews but was to exercise incalculable influence on the history of Western civilization. The interesting thing is that although these exiles included the whole of the influential citizens and priests of Jerusalem, the maintenance of even their faith turned on a knife-edge, and was due to the genius essentially of three great personalities: Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the unknown writer of the fortieth to the fifty-fifth chapters of Isaiah.

To the earlier band of exiles of 597 B.C., cut off from the worship of the Temple, Jeremiah wrote a letter commanding them in the name of Jehovah their God to settle quietly in the land and 'seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried captive and pray unto Jehovah for it; for in the peace thereof ye shall have peace.' This is to say that Israel's God, being God of all the earth, and loving mercy and not sacrifice, can be worshipped as freely in Babylonia as in Palestine. This great thought—the modern as opposed to the ancient, 'localised,' conception of Deity—took

root in the Jewish mind, became axiomatic, and is of course the basis on which the Jewish communities scattered eventually over the civilized world maintained their religious existence.

At first, however, the exiles of 597 B.C. were in despair. The fact that Jerusalem and the Temple still stood seemed to them the only remaining refuge for their faith, and when in 586 B.C. the city was again captured and sacked, and the Temple itself burnt, their consternation was complete and persistent: 'Our hope,' they are reported by Ezekiel to have said, 'is lost; we are clean cut off.' Faith perished in face of the dilemma—either Jehovah, in permitting the destruction of His city and Temple, shows that He has finally cast off His people, or the prophets who asserted His power as God of all the earth were deluded and in reality the gods of the Babylonians are more powerful than He.

At this crisis there blazed forth in their midst the message of a man of spiritual genius, Ezekiel, who in the course of a lifetime of exhortation and personal example succeeded in driving home to the mind and conscience of his fellow-exiles, or of the more thoughtful among them, those convictions, theological and ethical, which became the strong framework of Judaism. Passionately Ezekiel maintained that Israel's God is the only God, the supreme reality, and Zion's disaster, foretold by the Prophets, no proof of His weakness, but such a retribution of the sins of His people as vindicated His inexorable moral righteousness. Next, the present ruin is not irretrievable but disciplinary; and because the fathers sinned and the children suffer, it does not follow that the children are involved in hopeless condemnation. Let the individual, the present generation, the existing nation, but respond to the moral demand of God, and deliverance, personal and national, is sure.

Two aspects of Ezekiel's thought are less congenial to the modern mind—first, his visions of a gigantic warfare of Jehovah and His people against an alliance of hostile races (compare the 'apocalyptic' expecta-

tions which had so powerful an influence in later times, page 1960); and secondly he believed that more than moral purity of life was essential for the acceptable worship of Jehovah by the community, and that certain ancient customs of merely 'ritual' purity, laws of 'holiness,' must be observed as well. He pictured brilliantly and wistfully a Jerusalem restored; and so restored and ordered as to ensure that the laws of 'clean' and 'unclean,' of holiness in the technical sense, might be perfectly observed by a People whose heart also was clean.

In this second feature the influences of his youthful experience as a Priest of the Jerusalem Temple are visible, and it is customary from the modern standpoint to blame Ezekiel (and the Jewish leaders who were at one with him in his teaching) for thus incorporating into Judaism an irrational and non-moral element. But in its ancient setting the question cannot be judged so simply. Granting that henceforth the supreme danger against which Jewish religion would have to guard itself was the temptations of 'legalism,' it seems historically certain that the distinctive customs involved in the 'ritual-holiness' ideal—especially circumcision, the dietary laws, the observance of the Sabbath and abstinence from marriage with Gentiles—were invaluable aids to the creation of a strong sense of a nationality based in religion, marking the Jews out thus from other peoples. In the life and death struggle with Hellenic culture, philosophy and armed force three centuries later, it was a fervent nationalism finding expression in precisely these customs that preserved the Jews, no less than the superiority of their ethical-religious beliefs. Indeed up to the present time these rites have played an incalculably important part in the maintenance of Jewish race-distinction.

But Ezekiel's dream-picture of Zion had other consequences. It gave expression to the thoughts of many hearts. The actual Jerusalem had been too often a nightmare of bloodshed, oppression and poverty rather than a City of God; yet, like Athens or Edinburgh, it has ever been one of the cities that haunt the imagina-

tion of its inhabitants. No sooner had the real City perished than the ideal became alive. The longings of the exiles streamed out to it—as is exemplified in Psalm 137—and it was seen transfigured in their memories. Ezekiel's idealised Zion must have thrilled his contemporaries, as must also the enthusiastic vision of Jerusalem restored which glows in the glorious chapters 52, 54 and 60 of Isaiah.

Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem the Holy City. . . . Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.

Despite all the vicissitudes of her stormy and tragic fortunes, the love of Zion never waned but indeed grew in intensity, finding beautiful expression even as late as the medieval poetry of the Spanish Jews.

Jerusalem dominated the lives of Palestinian Jews, and held also the imagination of the Jews of distant lands, drawing them in multitudes to visit it on the great pilgrimages, making

Judaism rooted in the payment of the devotion to Jerusalem poll-tax for the Temple (a source of

indispensable strength for the often impoverished city) no burden but a joy. We have dwelt on this because it should be noted that passionate devotion to Jerusalem exercised as profound an influence for the creation and preservation of Judaism as any of the great religious motives.

The master-thoughts established in the minds of the exiles were these: There is one God only, Whose will is moral righteousness—Ruler of Nature, Whose power is therefore irresistible; Ruler of Mankind, therefore the events of history reflect His judgement on human sin. All His ordinances are to be obeyed, yet the essence of His service is the ethical law in the heart. Although, for example, sacrifice is enjoined, it has value not as a substitute for penitence but only as the expression of real penitence, individual or national. Finally, God has called Israel to a peculiar service in a Divine world-purpose for good—which does not imply a relaxation of Divine justice in Israel's favour, but does imply an immutable

hope for the nation, as assurance of a blessed destiny that must at last find glorious fulfilment.

On the eve of the Persian conquest of Babylon (c. 540 B.C.), these convictions received expression, surpassing even Ezekiel's, in the words of the nameless prophet cited above, whose utterances became part of the Book of Isaiah. Convinced that Israel's sin is expiated, this Prophet comforts his people with a message of the majesty of Jehovah, the only God; sees in Cyrus the agent of the restoration of Zion, and calls on the exiles to be ready for return. In four passages (perhaps of independent origin) known

as the Servant Songs, the Mission of Israel thought of the mission of in world history Israel in world history is

lifted above every trace of selfish glory in the intuition that the Servant's task is nothing less than the deliverance of all nations from the darkness of evil, and will be achieved through voluntary acceptance of suffering endured unto death itself, yet crowned with ultimate success.

The universalism of these passages, if nowhere expressed so wonderfully, does not stand alone in the Old Testament. We find it also in Psalm 87 and the allegorical Book of Jonah, where the Prophet (nation), hating the heathen and refusing the call to give them spiritual knowledge, ere long offers his own life for their safety, and is so constrained of God that he accomplishes his mission. The unique character and sublimity of this thought of Israel's function in the world should not be forgotten as we proceed to notice how the stress of events forced the Jews as a whole in the next five centuries towards a narrow nationalism and a more selfish conception of Israel's relation to other nations.

Given this moral interpretation of the disaster and these hopes for the renewal of Zion, the intellect of the exiles was liberated, and directed into new and unimpeded channels. Eagerly men began to study the records of the past to find wisdom for the present and guidance for the future. The Prophets, scorned in their lifetime, must be revered now; the Laws, great and small, that had been unheeded must be sought out, systematised

and obeyed. And the growing prosperity and leisure of life in Babylonia, its freedom from military anxieties, provided the opportunity for study. Here then we envisage the fruitful activities of Scribes retelling the popular tales of ancient Israel, reshaping the records of its history in the light of prophetic doctrine, and co-ordinating legal and ritual traditions. (It should be understood that, whatever pre-exilic material be contained in it, the Pentateuch as a whole in its present form is a monument embodying the conceptions of the great Prophets and the intricate labours of Jewish priests and students of the Law subsequent to the Exile.)

Moreover the Jewish instinct for worship, cut off from the Temple festivals, discovered an invaluable medium of

expression in popular gatherings, especially on the Sabbath, for religious reading, prayer, instruction and discussion, and the singing of psalms. The initiation of this 'synagogue' type of worship, ordinary as it appears nowadays, was an infinitely important matter. Our information on its development is scanty, and probably in Palestine the glamour of the sacrificial-liturgical cult of the restored Temple for long sufficed the imagination of the people and checked the growth of the synagogue; but from the second century B.C. it developed so successfully that when the hour came for the destruction of the Temple the discipline of the synagogue was able to carry on the spiritual education of the people in Palestine as elsewhere. Thus, at the close of the sixth century it is clear that these Babylonian exiles had attained on unprecedented lines a national coherence, practically independent of, yet also inspired by, the lively hope of rebuilding Zion. In theory they but awaited the Divine summons to return.

The conquest of Babylonia by the Persians in 539 B.C. made possible the return of the exiles and so disclosed to many the gulf between theory and practice. It was one thing to approve the dreams and schemes of the Prophets, and quite another to break up the prosperity of Babylonian homes and businesses. From the contemporary evidence of the

Books of Haggai and Zechariah it seems that not 50,000 as the Chronicler supposed, but at most a handful of zealous exiles returned to Jerusalem between 537 and 520 B.C. In 520 B.C., however, there was a fairly coherent population, with a civil governor of Davidic lineage, Zerubbabel (perhaps a returned exile), and a high priest, Joshua. But no miraculous highway in the desert had appeared and the walls were useless for defence; and if any effort to repair them had been made, it had failed. The harvests were bad. The community was weak, impoverished and dispirited.

At this juncture two Prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, roused the people to essay the rebuilding of the Temple, urging them to cease sighing for miracles and the vanished glories of Solomon's cedars of Lebanon, and Haggai exhorted them to build—a brave message—with such local wood as they could get; whilst Zechariah rebuked the pessimism of those who 'despised the day of small things.' By 516 B.C. the Temple was rebuilt, and though with the walls unrestored the fate of the city hung ever in the balance, the feat put new heart into the Jews. Jerusalem might once more become the religious focus of the Jewish race.

Very interesting is the insight of those Prophets, which could see that the primary need of the community was the restoration not of its fortifications

but of its faith in God. Faith more needful than fortifications

that the repair of the walls was the first task, Zechariah boldly declared that God would give such safety and prosperity to His city that no walls whatever would be wanted. Revolts against the Persian Empire, which had seemed to some to herald the Messianic age, had collapsed and the world was held quiet in its grasp; yet still greater, he declared, is the reality of Jehovah, watching vigilantly over His people's welfare. Messianic longing was rife, and it even seems that Zerubbabel himself was expected to be revealed in power as the Messianic King. Religious hope was the dominant feature; Zechariah wrote: 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah.'

Unfortunately, after 520 B.C., there is a complete blank in the history for some sixty years, and we know nothing of Zerubbabel's fate. But undoubtedly no kingdom was established, and the days of the Messiah were not yet. Pretensions to a monarchy may well have roused effective opposition on the part of Jerusalem's neighbours, Edom and Samaria. Perhaps there was dissension between the native population of the city and the returned exiles. There are certainly signs of serious antagonism between Zerubbabel and the high priest Joshua (to Zechariah's dismay), and the priestly faction apparently won the struggle and secured the real authority—'This internal political change is the cardinal fact in the history of the post-exilic age' (S. A. Cook). The new Jerusalem was, in fact, no heavenly city; and the triumph of the idealism at its core is all the more interesting from a modern standpoint in that it was won in the face of bitter disappointments and crushing difficulties. When about 450 B.C.

information is again available, it is clear that the high hopes of Zechariah's generation had been shattered, and the fortunes of the city had reached a miserably low ebb.

The next stage is the rebuilding of the walls by Nehemiah (c. 450-400 B.C.). Spasmodic attempts to repair the gigantic breaches may have been made earlier, but, if so, they failed from the weakness of the population or the antagonism of neighbours; and again it is likely that some quite considerable disaster befell the city in the early part of the fifth century. In 445 B.C. Nehemiah, an influential Jew at the Court of Artaxerxes I in Susa, was so moved by a report of Jerusalem's pitiable condition that he sought and obtained the Persian king's authority to visit it in person and essay the repair of the walls.

Certain graphic memoirs written by Nehemiah himself have fortunately been embedded in the Chronicler's confused narrative of this period, and yield one of those vivid, personal stories with which antiquity is occasionally illuminated. We



'THE NOBLE SANCTUARY' UPON THE SITE OF KING SOLOMON'S TEMPLE

Christian architects working for the first Moslem khalifs in the seventh century erected the Haram el-Sherif, 'the noble Sanctuary,' on the Hill of Zion. In its centre is the Dome of the Rock, so named from an outcrop of stone beneath it, identified as the threshing floor of Araunah upon which David raised an altar and King Solomon later placed the permanent altar of his temple. The wall-girt platform contains all that remains to day of the majestic succession of temples at Jerusalem.

Photo, E.N.A.

read of his arrival and secret inspection of the ruinous walls by night; of his summons to the Jews for swift action and their response enheartened by his strong personality and royal authority; of the repulse of Samaritan opposition at first by the diplomatic weapon of the permit, then by armed resistance, and finally and not least by Nehemiah's wise countering of plots for his undoing which were made both by the enemy without and by their partisans within Jerusalem. In fifty-two days, by September 444 B.C., the walls were so repaired that Jerusalem was again a fortress.

Thereafter Nehemiah showed himself a statesman, taking steps to augment the number of its inhabitants, improve its internal administration

Nehemiah as practical statesman and induce kindlier relations between the rich and poor. But the lax

Jews and the Samaritans were strong and on his return to Persia his reforms were undone. In 432 B.C. he returned and this time took more drastic action, particularly with regard to certain abuses arising from the intermarriage of Jews and aliens and the non-observance of the Sabbath laws. One consequence was the expulsion from Jerusalem of a priest, Manasseh, grandson of the high priest, and son-in-law of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, and this event marks a decisive stage in the breach of relations with the Samaritans.

With the age of Nehemiah the Chronicler associates the work of Ezra, a scribe from Babylonia. But his account of Ezra is so palpably unreliable that it has been argued that 'Ezra' is merely a fictitious 'patron saint' of the scribal and priestly classes. On the other hand it is reasonable to think that Nehemiah's heroic effort aroused the Babylonian Jews, and that after (not before) Nehemiah's reforms a body of exiles was led by Ezra back to Jerusalem eager to complete Nehemiah's work on its religious side, and to persuade the Zionists to co-ordinate their legal practice with the full code which had been elaborated in Babylonia. At least it seems certain that from about this date we have to think of the Jews, alike in Babylonia and Jerusalem, as cherishing the Mosaic Law in virtually

its present form and regarding it as the inspired standard for their national faith and customs.

The most significant feature of this period is that Nehemiah was constrained to a policy of exclusion. The folk of mixed blood, and especially the Samaritans, had felt themselves with good reason part of a fairly homogeneous and tolerably Jewish land. In a way it was tragedy that they could not be included in the renaissance state, and Browne (*Early Judaism*) argues that here is a watershed for Jewish religion: a turning away from the self-sacrificing, universal, missionary conception of Isaiah 53 (actively resumed in Christian doctrine) towards a mere nationalism. But it may be replied that the conception of a world-mission did not wholly die out from Jewish theology, and that Nehemiah's policy was inevitable in the circumstances. A stricter Judaism was the need of the hour; to have essayed more would have lost all. The latitudinarian religious attitude of the Palestinians made them impossible. As with the Puritan movement in England, a measure of fanaticism was unavoidable. Judaism was battling for its very existence and it was as yet in no position to assimilate the unenthusiastic.

With the establishment of a strict Judaism at Jerusalem a change began to appear in the attitude of Jewish settlements abroad. By Nehemiah's time there were doubtless many Jews in foreign lands

(besides those in Babylonia); but hitherto their practice of the ancestral worship of Jehovah either lapsed or was perilously lax (see the Elephantine evidence, page 1945). Hereafter the augmentation of Jewish settlers from Palestine in the cities of the surrounding countries—which became very rapid in the Greek age—tended naturally to consist of Jews who at least knew well the duties of strict Judaism. The Jews of the Dispersion therefore begin to be truly Jewish.

The last hundred years of the Persian Empire (430-330 B.C.) seem to have been relatively 'eventless' for Jerusalem. The quarrel with the Samaritans hardened, and with the completion (by 330 B.C., but

perhaps earlier) of a rival Temple on Mount Gerizim, which claimed in opposition to Jerusalem to be the one legitimate Sanctuary of Jehovah in the land, the embitterment of relations was complete.

These relatively quiet years were invaluable for the consolidation of Judaism. The obscurity of the history, says G. A. Smith, conceals

the constant labour of the olive, the vine and the corn—it is that mellow haze beneath which life in field and town runs perhaps the more busily that the horizons are narrow. . . . We are to conceive the Jews, through the rest of the Persian Period, as settling into those habits of life which ever afterwards distinguished them—the observance of the Sabbath, and the three great annual festivals, the system of sacrifices, the application of the ritual to the routine and emergencies of life, whether individual or national, the appointment, duties and rights of the priests, the influence of the High-Priest without a rival to dispute his gradual advancement to the political headship of the nation, and the

institution around him of a college of priests and nobles—all these must have been developed and confirmed.

Moreover the Jewish mind was active in other directions than the Law and Temple-worship. A 'practical' philosophy of conduct, expressing itself in sententious and often memorable proverbs, was being formulated; and that it served a useful educational purpose in the hands of its exponents (the 'Wise') is evident from the Book of Proverbs. Continuing as a very 'live' movement on into the Greek period, it culminates in a fascinating book, Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Ben Sirach, c. 200 B.C.—a mirror of the social life of the times and of the ideals of a sensible, godly Jewish citizen, who would fain restrain youth from the follies of the age, and believed that the old-fashioned morality, rooted in reverence for Jehovah, was the guiding principle of a happy and




**SAMARITAN ALTAR OF SACRIFICE UPON MOUNT GERIZIM**

Friction with the Samaritans began almost immediately after the return of the Jews from exile in Babylonia, and the rupture became complete about 330 B.C., or a little earlier, when the Samaritans erected a rival temple upon Mount Gerizim. Mount Gerizim is especially sacred to Samaritans as the scene of Abraham's sacrifice, and they still gather on its summit to keep the Passover, roasting a lamb on an altar of sacrifice and reciting prayers in the old Samaritan dialect.

*Photo, American Colony at Jerusalem*





ANCIENT COPY OF THE TORAH

Strictly, the Torah or Book of the Law comprises only the Pentateuch. This was inscribed on rolls and kept in a shrine in the synagogue. Tradition says that this copy, at Shechem, was written by Eleazar, son of Aaron.

successful life. But life has its tragic agonies and ironies; and the Prophets, wrestling with the fate of the nation, had been scarcely concerned with the mystery of the life of the individual. Hence in this age (in Ecclesiastes, Job and certain of the finest Psalms) we see an effort to grapple with the sharp problems of pain, death and unmerited suffering, with their seeming denial of Divine justice, in the individual human life.

Further reference must be made to the Psalter. Psalmody there must have been in connexion with the pre-exilic Temple. But the Psalter, as it now stands, is essentially a monument of post-exilic Judaism. And what an achievement! Every aspect of Jewish feeling is present here. It lays bare the soul of the nation, collectively and individually—intellect, heart and conscience; all its spiritual need and

immortal aspiration. Post-exilic Judaism must be measured by nothing less than this its superb religious creation.

Frequently Judaism is represented as merely a lamentable lapse from the heights of the great Prophets into the depths of a 'barren legalism.' This we believe to be a profound misjudgement, which is the consequence in part of an endeavour to weigh the Old Testament in the scales with Christianity, without due consideration of the evolution of Jewish religion in and for itself, and in part of a failure to realize how far the post-exilic law succeeded in applying the cardinal doctrines of the Prophets to the whole life of the community and the individual. Broadly speaking, it was amazingly successful. From one point of view the Prophets are unsurpassable; yet the age of the Law should be seen as the next, onward stage in evolution; much as the history of the Christian Church is not a lapse from the Gospel, but the necessary practical endeavour to realize the Gospel upon earth. The question whether Judaism would develop towards or away from barren legalism depended on whether the Law would come to be treated statically as a series of plain enactments, or dynamically as a source of moral and spiritual principles; whether or not it would be felt that 'God had yet more truth to break forth out of His Word.'

Again, it is said that in the post-exilic age the idea of God moved towards a remote transcendence, a God operating on the world only distantly through a hypostatized **Judaism revealed in the Psalms** of angelic Beings. The supplications of the Psalter are alone a sufficient refutation of the charge. Judaism, no less than Christianity, had to strive to hold the balance between realization of the Divine Majesty and belief in God's accessibility to the soul of Man. It is absolutely untrue that God was conceived as less accessible to prayer either in this age or in later Jewish thought (as is shown, for example, in the Rabbinic saying, 'Though the distance from earth to heaven be a journey of five hundred years, yet when Man whispers, or even meditates a prayer, God is at hand to hear it').

How far was Judaism affected by Persian religious philosophy? A difficult question! It is impossible not to be affected by a dominant civilization of which one is part. The deepened sense of a struggle between world-forces of Good and Evil, speculative imaginings about angels and demons, these perhaps reflect Persian influence. But there was never a sharp dualism in Jewish thought, and its lore of angels and demons was a poetic rather than an essential aspect of its theological system. The fundamental pillars of Jewish belief had been independently built up, and were being characteristically maintained.

But the vitality of Judaism was about to be tested in an extraordinary fashion, through contact, at first peaceable, then violent, with a civilization no less forcible than itself and in many respects more brilliant. When in 332 B.C. Alexander of Macedon at the head of a Greek army conquered the Persian Empire and became master of the known world, his campaign had far more than military effect.

Alexander had realized that the Greek ideals were indissolubly connected with the democratic form of the Greek city.

Accordingly new cities in Greek style were created at strategic centres, and the old cities conformed to the Hellenic model, so far as possible. There was organization for free election of magistrates, and halls for them to meet in council; shady porticoes where the citizens might meet to lounge and talk; baths and gymnasia; a hippodrome for the games, and for the drama a theatre. The youth of the cities became enthusiastic for the gaieties and glories of the competitive games, as was natural. There were festal processions in which contingents of young athletes attested the wealth and pride of their several cities by the splendour of their attire. But staid folk also were caught by the glamour of Hellenism. Sleepy Eastern merchants found they must cater for the new tastes or lose their trade. Greek soon became the language of the market place, a truly cosmopolitan tongue. Finally, the learning of the East confessed its conqueror; Greek art and literature,

science and philosophy, made the old Eastern modes seem worthless.

Jerusalem lay aside from the main current of Hellenic influence, yet there also within a century of Alexander's death Hellenism had become desperately tempting. Judaism menaced 'Tempting' materially—by Hellenism for imagine the coming and going of Greek traders in the bazaars of Jerusalem, and the opportunities afforded to every acute and enterprising Jew in the great Hellenic mercantile centres now spread around him, with (most of all) Alexandria only a few days' journey to the south. 'Tempting' socially—for Hellenism was becoming the atmosphere men breathed, and ere long it spread its social and even its athletic allurements very visibly before the eyes of the young and ambitious in Jerusalem. And intellectually, most of all, how brilliant Hellenism was!

The tables were turned on the Jews, who hitherto could at least despise the mental outlook of their pagan conquerors. Now they found themselves in danger of being gently smiled at as 'country cousins,' who must be educated out of rustic ways. 'The heathen world broke upon the shores of Judah no longer, as Isaiah heard it,' says G. A. Smith, 'with the wrathful crash of the stormy sea upon the harbourless coast of Palestine, but with the music of freedom, adventure, wealth and a liberal and boundless happiness.' Opposition to the Hellenic fashions, of course, existed; but the noble and wealthy families, and (worst) the priestly circles were permeated with worldly ambition and grew indifferent to the antique standards of strict Judaism.

Had the impact of Hellenism continued to be thus by 'peaceful penetration,' Judaism would perhaps have disintegrated. Yet within fifty years from 200 B.C. the situation was astonishingly transformed. Two things saved Judaism. First, the pro-Hellenic party in Jerusalem overstepped the bounds of common decency. Proceeding to extremes in their cynical disregard of the old ways, they utterly scandalised the ordinary man. And then, secondly, it happened that a brilliant but fanatical Hellenist, Antiochus

Epiphanes, became king of Syria. Incensed for various reasons against the anti-Hellenic element among the Jews, he resolved to stamp out by violence the opposition of the orthodox; and after an unforgettable defilement of the Jerusalem Temple, instituted in 168 B.C. the first great religious persecution in history. Circumcision and observance of the Sabbath were declared illegal. Copies of the Law were hunted out for destruction, and their owners put to death.

Numbers of Jews suffered martyrdom; but later, this passive attitude of the Party of the Law (the Hasidim, 'The faithful') was abandoned and they rallied to the call for active opposition, which in heroic circumstances was made by an aged priest, Mattathias of Modin, and his five sons, of whom Judas, surnamed 'Maccabaeus,' proved a brilliant leader. A series of almost unhopèd-for victories was won against Syrian generals, and in 165 B.C., Judas was in possession of the city of Jerusalem, the Temple was cleansed and in December re-dedicated to Jehovah amidst great rejoicing. The following year the Jewish fortunes were chequered, but (admitting political defeat) they were accorded religious freedom. Plainly, however, this situation was precarious. Fighting broke out again, and despite a great victory at Adasa in 161 B.C., the Jews had to appeal to Rome for support.

Rome sympathised, but meantime Judas was defeated and killed, and the Hellenists without and within the nation were uppermost again. The 'ungodly' triumphed and took revenge, and the advocates of the Law were in desperate straits. The Maccabean brothers

**Triumph of the  
Hasmonæan princes** continued the struggle,  
and after vicissitudes  
of fortune Jonathan,

in 153 B.C., aided by division in the Syrian Kingdom, was at last in control of Jerusalem and formally recognized as high priest. Slain by treachery, he was succeeded in 142 B.C. by Simon, last of the five brothers, who still further strengthened the Jewish military position, compelled the Syrian king, Demetrius II, to acknowledge the political freedom of the Jews, and was triumphantly proclaimed at Jerusalem as high priest and general and civil

ruler 'for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet.' The era of independence had begun under the rule of the Maccabæan, or, as they are more often termed, the Hasmonæan priest-kings.


Judaism had created a Jewish state, but an unhappy one with small prospect of stability. Beset by external dangers, it was riven by strife within. There had been bitter divisions between the 'godly' and the 'ungodly' throughout the life and death of the struggle with Syria, and of party strife the Maccabæan victory obviously did not mean that every Jew was converted to an equal enthusiasm for the Law; neither did it in the least alter the culture of the world in general. Jerusalem was still but an island in an ocean of Hellenism, and the temptation to regard the strict observance of the law as obscurantism, and to 'Hellenise' to some extent, was as subtle and as powerful as ever. Unhappily under the Hasmonæan priest-kings party strife deepened, flaming at times into horrible persecutions and bloodshed, and is henceforth the deadliest factor in the tragedy of Jewish politics.

On one side was the 'Puritan' element, descendants of the Hasidim, the students of the Law, the Scribes—all in fact who were really zealous for the Law, the truly religious, the fervent nationalists. This party became known about this period as the 'Pharisees.' Over against these were ranged the 'Sadducees'—all the more worldly-minded, the wealthy and noble houses (whose interests, social and commercial, required relations with the Gentiles), together with the great priestly families, whose leader, the Hasmonæan high priest and king, drawn by political ambitions, gravitated towards this Sadducean party. The union of the high-priestly and kingly offices was fatal; the functions of the high priest were subordinated to worldly aims to the scandal of decent-minded Jews, and unrest ensued. The Sadducees, at least the priestly families, were not antagonistic to a conventional observance of the Law. Naturally they stood for the upkeep of the Temple, with its ritual and priestly revenues; but they did not intend to be 'righteous overmuch.'

A summary of events down to A.D. 70 must now be given. In 135 B.C. Simon was murdered, but his son, John Hyrcanus I, reasserted the Hasmonaean control and widely extended Jewish rule, conquering Samaria (where he destroyed the hated Temple of Gerizim), and also Edom or Idumaea, whose inhabitants he compelled to profess Judaism—an act of persecution for which later the Jews suffered a nemesis in the domination of Jerusalem by the Idumaeen Herod. As Gwatkin writes, 'it was a brilliant reign, but it marked the transition from the heroic Maccabees to the vulgar kings who followed.' Hyrcanus' successor, Aristobulus I (105-104 B.C.), known as Philhellen, formally called himself king, and behaved like an evil Oriental despot.

In the next reign, that of Alexander Jannaeus (104-78 B.C.), Jewish freedom was almost lost in war with Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, and there was civil war besides. The Pharisees, disgusted by seeing a man like Jannaeus acting as high priest, and aided by popular sympathy, which a massacre perpetrated by Jannaeus had roused, revolted against the king and the Sadducees. Jannaeus triumphed, crucified (it is said) eight hundred Pharisees, and held a dissolute banquet in sight of their dying agonies. This horror is but a foretaste of the miseries and massacres that make this age of Jewish story as terrible as anything in history. Jannaeus' widow, Alexandra Salome, favoured the Pharisees, who then took their vengeance.

With her death the climax was at hand. Of her two sons the elder, Hyrcanus II, the titular king and high priest, was a weakling, while the younger, Aristobulus, had ambition and force of character. Perhaps Hyrcanus might have suffered his brother to be king and himself acted as high priest (when Jewish history might have been vastly different), but behind Hyrcanus stood a subtle personality, his adviser, the Idumaeen Antipater; and behind the whole scene was looming up



RELIC OF HEROD'S TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM

Foreigners were not allowed to pass beyond the Court of the Gentiles into the Inner Forecourt of the Temple. Tablets were put up in front of the forbidden parts bearing an inscription in Greek and Latin characters warning all strangers that death would be the certain penalty for infringement of the rule.

*Museum Tschitull-Kirakhi, Constantinople*

the mighty power of Rome, now closely concerned in the affairs of Egypt and the Near East. After much strife both brothers appealed to the Romans for support, and 63 B.C. saw a Roman army under Pompey besieging a Jerusalem again internally divided. The city was betrayed, the Temple was bloodily stormed and Pompey entered the Holy of Holies, probably without realizing how unforgettable he was thereby outraging Jewish sentiment. He suffered Hyrcanus to remain as high priest but not king, and left a Roman garrison in Jerusalem. Independence was lost; the rule of Rome had begun; and the troubles of Judah were not ended.

The last half of the first century B.C. was crowded with the vast events which marked the transition of Rome from a Republic to an Empire. In the grasp of Rome Biding his time behind Hyrcanus, the Idumaeen Antipater sought to ingratiate himself with the Romans, and eventually was so useful to Julius Caesar in his campaign of 47 B.C. against Ptolemy of Egypt that he won for himself the procuratorship of all Palestine, and for the Jews many privileges. Notwithstanding the privileges, the Jews hated him. His assassination in 43 B.C.,



#### HERODIAN ARCHITECTURE RECALLED


Scarcely anything remains of Jerusalem as Hellenised by Herod. At Bethlehem, however, in the Church of the Nativity, are Roman columns and capitals in an admirable state of preservation, and the building bears a close resemblance to a basilica of Herodian days, with its fine colonnaded vista.

*Photo, Prof. J. L. Garstang*

however, only delivered them after terrible strife, culminating in yet another siege and capture of Jerusalem, into the power of his second son, Herod, an even greater

and more sinister personality than his father. So much was Herod 'persona grata' with Rome that he was allowed the title of king.

Favoured by Rome, he ruled with outward splendour for thirty years, and rebuilt the Temple on a magnificent scale. But the Jews saw in him no true King of Israel, but only an Edomite usurper on the throne of David. And indeed his subjects had much reason to loathe him, apart from his Edomite blood. Inured to horrors as men were, they yet found his ferocity to known and suspected foes terrifying, and were shocked at the ghastly series of murders and executions within his own family circle (including those of his wife and two sons) to which his suspicions gave rise. Most of all they abominated him for the veiled scorn of his merely conventional Judaism. He made the high priesthood more than ever



#### LAST AND FINEST OF THE SUCCESSIVE TEMPLES AT JERUSALEM


In the year 20 B.C., Herod set about the building of a new temple to replace Zerubbabel's Temple, which had been seriously damaged in the fighting seventeen years before. All secular buildings were cleared from the hill and on the enlarged area a temple arose of unprecedented splendour. In general plan it was similar to its predecessor, with the same distinctions between the various courts, but its Sanctuary was loftier. In A.D. 70 the temple was utterly destroyed.

*After a model by Dr. Schick: photo, American Colony at Jerusalem*

contemptible by conferring it at his pleasure on evil men. At his heart he was a Hellenic unbeliever, and he showed his real sympathies in constructing new cities in Palestine on Greek lines (as, for example, Caesarea), building heathen temples in them, favouring Greeks and Romans at his court, and scandalising

years are a nightmare of cruel injustice ferociously resented. The later procurators were impossible. As Gwatkin writes:

Albinus took bribes from all sides, let no assassin remain in prison who could pay for release, allowed rival High Priests to fight out their quarrel in the streets, and tried his own hand at brigandage. Yet even



SPLENDID RUINS OF THE ROMAN CITY OF GERASA

Jerash, in the mountains of Gilead on the east side of Jordan, has many ruins to attest the splendour of the Hellenised Palestinian city Gerasa. The walls, still partly standing, had a circuit of about two miles and the Via Principalis was about half a mile long. This was a continuous colonnade, the larger part of which is still entire, and it terminated in a Forum, the position of which is indicated by this great semicircle of Ionic columns connected by an entablature (see also pages 2056-57).

*Photo, Captain C. Fenwick-Owen*

Jerusalem with Greek public games. The Jews rejoiced at the mental and physical torment that attended his sickness and death in 4 B.C.


Ten years later Rome instituted direct control, making Judah a province under a minor procurator. We have reached the years which hold the story of Jesus of Nazareth, but that life and death, with its inexhaustible consequences for humanity, does not fall to be considered here. Pontius Pilate is remembered where all other procurators of Judaea are forgotten; but merciless and provocative as he was, from the Jewish point of view he was by no means the worst of the series.

Rome in her imperial grandeur meant well by the Jews, but she could not comprehend that the peculiarity and intensity of the Jewish faith and patriotism made the little land a first-rate colonial problem; and her error in appointing as procurators men of second-rate ability and tenth-rate character made her government of Judaea the greatest blot on her administrative record. These miserable

Albinus was a just ruler compared with his successor, Gessius Florus (A.D. 64-66). From robbery and murder of individuals he came to the destruction of whole cities. The brigands might do what they pleased, if only Florus got his share of the spoil.

Suddenly Jerusalem flamed in tumult, the Roman garrison was massacred, and the revolt became general. The last scene was set. Rome had to put forth her strength.

Vespasian with an army of 60,000 opened the campaign in A.D. 67. Vivid details are preserved for us by Josephus, the Jewish historian, who himself fought in its opening stages in Galilee. In A.D. 69 Vespasian—made emperor by the Syrian legions in this year—left his son Titus at the gates of Jerusalem to complete the siege of the city. Despite the internecine and crazy fury of no less than three factions within its walls, desperate resistance was offered; but at last the defences were pierced, and the agonies of famine, pestilence and violence terminated in the capture of the Temple area on August 9, A.D. 70. The end of the Jewish state had



VICTORY COIN OF VESPASIAN

Vespasian's great military achievement was the conquest of Judaea, begun by him in A.D. 67. It is commemorated in this coin, the palm tree symbolising the country, and the dejected woman seated underneath it the enslaved Jewish population.

*British Museum*

come. One last effort to restore it was made in A.D. 135—the revolt of Bar Kokhba, a supposed Messiah—but it was defeated with awful slaughter. What other nation could have survived such protracted agonies and such ultimate overwhelming disaster? Yet the strength of Judaism was actually unimpaired; indeed, it only revealed itself clearly when

Jerusalem was no more. We turn from the political failure to its amazing sequel.


The depths of Jewish life lay beneath the tempest-tossed surface of its political struggle. When we tear our eyes from the tragedy of Jerusalem we perceive Judaism established in a vastly larger setting. In the last two centuries B.C. Jewish settlements outside Palestine had grown enormously in size and number, and were everywhere loyal to the distinctive Jewish observances, despite the disintegrating pressure of the Hellenic culture in which they were immersed. National traditions, family ties and business interests doubtless helped, but essentially they owed their marvellous preservation of race-consciousness to the unifying power of their religion, interpreted by the Scribes and Pharisees. The Pharisees are known to most people solely through their appearances in the



TRIUMPHAL PROCESSION WITH SPOILS FROM THE TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM

Vespasian left the task of actually completing the conquest of Judaea to his son, Titus, who accomplished it by the capture of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The event is commemorated in the Arch of Titus. This panel under the arch shows the laurel-crowned Roman soldiers carrying the spoils of Jerusalem, including the golden table of shew-bread with two of the sacred silver trumpets, and the great seven-branched candlestick of pure gold which was an especially sacred object to the Jews.


*Photo, Anderson*



Ancient synagogues generally lay north and south, had three doors to the south, and were sometimes divided by columns into a nave and two aisles. This restoration of the synagogue at Capernaum, built about A.D. 200 as an ampler reconstruction of an older synagogue, shows the general type.

Outside to the east was a colonnaded courtyard—probably used for ablutions before worship.

From Kohl and Walsinger, 'Antike Synagogen in Galiläa': J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig




#### THE SYNAGOGUE: FOCUS OF THE NATIONAL LIFE OF JEWRY

Synagogue worship had its beginning in the great exile, among the Jewish settlers in Babylonia. Probably it was not until the period of Nehemiah in the fifth century that it took firm root in Palestine, but thereafter it quickly attained supreme importance as the focus of national life. Remains of very ancient buildings of this class exist in several parts of Galilee; for example, this ruined synagogue at Kefr Birin on the Sea of Galilee, fabled to be the burial place of Queen Esther,

Photo, F. M. Good





#### JEWISH RELICS FROM THE CATACOMBS

In early Christian times a common gift to a friend was a glass cup containing a small gold disk engraved with some emblem of good will, and these disks were often placed in the tomb at death. These specimens show scrolls of the law, seven-branched candlesticks, the lion of Judah and other Jewish emblems.

*From Bevan and Singer, 'The Legacy of Israel,' Clarendon Press*

Gospels and are apt to be judged accordingly. But just as the Christian ministry must not be estimated by the fact that in decadent periods of the Church's history many of the clergy were guilty of formality or worse, so it must be grasped that Pharisaism was a great movement with a long history, having spiritual possibilities as well as perils. Even in the early part of the first century there were enough noble-minded Pharisees of the type of Nicodemus or (to cite the great name of Jewish annals) Hillel to have won for them the respect of the mass of the Jewish people, who knew the Sadducees for worldly cosmopolitans but the Pharisees for patriots and religious loyalists.

One important point must be stressed. The Sadducees saw nothing in the Law beyond its plain meaning; that and that only was to be considered. But the attitude of the Pharisees towards the Law was fundamentally different, and by them Jewish thought was saved from stagnation and extinction. As Cohen (Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity) puts it :

It is true that what is suitable for one age is not so for a later age—that could not be helped: Jewish Law for the Sadducee was, is and must be for ever the same . . . The Pharisees found in the Laws of the Scriptures not so much unalterable enactments as principles of action . . . the Rabbis were progressive, forward-looking men, and they insisted on the necessity of an Oral Law to make the Written Law adaptable to facts. In their hands Jewish religious law became a thing of infinite flexibility, a system which paid regard to, and made provision for the need of each age.

The Jews of the Dispersion had discovered in their Law—thus studied as an active Word of God wherein guidance would be found for Israel amidst changing circumstances and in every land—a bond of union, an unending interest, a lively hope. Their life was now centred not on the Temple but on the synagogue; not on the king or even on the high priest, but on the teachers of the Law. Consequently, though

the downfall of Jerusalem, with the abolition of the Temple and its sacrifices, was a terrific shock to their sentiment, it did not affect the Judaism of their daily life. They still found themselves possessed of a philosophy with which they could confront Greek learning, and of a standard of moral conduct which raised them above their heathen neighbours.

The peril of dissolution was greatest, of course, in Palestine. Yet even there the way of deliverance was found. To some extent men took comfort in Apocalyptic writings, with their predictions of a miraculous consummation of all things, a Divine vindication of the righteous in Israel, a Reign of God about to be revealed in His own time. But how near earnest believers came to despair is seen in two such writings, dating probably just after the Fall of Jerusalem—the Apocalypse of Baruch and the second book of Esdras. The writer of Second Esdras would fain find refuge from the horrors of the time in this promise of a Reign of Messiah and a Resurrection; yet, even so, he questions

how such evils as now are can possibly be reconciled with a righteous God.

The Apocalypses in certain circles only served to stimulate wild political revolt against Rome: there were those who sought to take the Kingdom of God by force. But deeper minds and gentler spirits felt that for this the help of man was vain, and read these writings as teaching rather that man should both hope and wait patiently for the revelation of God's goodness in the fullness of time. For such minds the fall of Jerusalem would but confirm their trust in God, and not in Man.

In Palestine, as elsewhere, indubitably it was not Apocalyptic visions but the sober teaching of the Pharisaic doctrine which proved the salvation of Judaism. Loyalists though they were, many of the Pharisees had stood aloof from, or were half-hearted in, the desperate attempt to overthrow Rome by force. And, indeed, it was reasonable to feel that the fury of the Zealots, and the shocking factional strife which paralysed their effort, could not be the way to do the will of God. Might not the real duty of the godly Jew, even in Palestine, be to leave politics to providence, and seek a life of quiet obedience to the divine law? With the hour came the man—Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai—who, at the fall of Jerusalem, with Roman permission, established at Jamnia (near the coast, south of Jaffa) what Judaism supremely needed, a school of the Law of outstanding eminence. Thanks to Johanan's noble character and great learning, Jamnia rapidly became an intellectual centre for the race, the only metropolis they really needed, a spiritual Jerusalem, void of political offence.

At the close of the first century A.D. the broad fact thus stands out that the Jews had not been merged, or submerged, in the general Hellenic culture, but were proudly conscious that they had become a unique people, homeless yet at home everywhere, scattered yet coherent. 'Amid the seeming cosmos and actual chaos of the Graeco-Roman Em-

pire,' to quote the phrase of Wellhausen, 'the Jews stood out like a rock.'

In the Dispersion they were preserved by the same positive religion, here impressing them with a sense of moral and national superiority to the Gentile population with its idolatrous polytheism, its 'mystery' ceremonies, or its puzzled philosophising. So far from being absorbed in Hellenism, Judaism now began to absorb the Gentiles; there sprang up a most active missionary movement of deep interest. Seneca declared that 'the whole world is rushing towards Jewish observances,' an exaggeration which proves the importance of the movement. The Sibylline Oracles speak of the Jews feeling themselves called to be 'guides to mortal men.' Judaism, rejoicing in its faith, inevitably found itself offering its truths to thousands of Gentile men and women who stood perplexed in thought and starved for moral leadership, hungering for a religion they could believe in and a duty they could live for. This missionary movement ceased; in part because of the growing power and attraction of the Christian Gospel, in part through the disastrous revolution of Bar Kokhba in 135 A.D. which so infuriated the Roman authorities against all Jews that persecution set in, and propagation of Jewish beliefs became impossible.

It follows that the thought-energies of Judaism were driven in within its own borders; its spiritual effort had to become concentrated upon its own people. How powerful the effect has been upon the Jews is proved by their continuance and present strength after so many centuries of repression and oppression. The Judaism which thus so marvellously survived the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., whatever its ultimate function in the future belief of mankind, has shown itself a religion intense and definite, impinging most closely on the home life, as well as on the communal life of its people; a religion which has hitherto had sufficient vitality to grow and adapt itself to the needs of many generations and many lands.

Persistence  
of Judaism

# TABLE OF DATES FOR CHRONICLE XI

A.D.		185	Verus takes official command in the East, but the work is done by Avidius Cassius and other competent officers, Verus taking to himself the credit, and the title of Parthicus.
98	Death of Nerva.	186	Unrest on the upper and middle Danube frontiers, where Quadi and Marcomanni are in movement.
	Trajan (Marcus Ulpius Trajanus) emperor, having been already associated with Nerva as Caesar. Trajan completes military organization on the Rhine, and returns to Rome.		Outbreak of plague. Religious revival, and severe persecution of Christians.
	Revival of the policy of expansion.	187	Marcus and Verus march against the Quadi, who seek and obtain peace.
101	Trajan's first campaign on the Danube.	188	Death of Verus; Marcus sole emperor.
102	Trajan forces the 'Iron Gates' and penetrates Dacia.	189-179	Repeated campaigns of Marcus in Pannonia.
103	Pliny pro-prætor in Pontus. Correspondence with Trajan about the attitude he is to adopt towards the Christians.	176	Revolt of Avidius Cassius, the successful commander of the Parthian war. He is put to death by his own followers.
104	Conquest of Dacia and death of the Dacian king Decebalus.	177-180	Sarmatian war. Commodus the son and heir of Marcus is with the army.
106	Erection of the Forum and Column of Trajan in Rome.	180	Death of Marcus Aurelius.
	Colonisation of Dacia.		Accession of Commodus.
114	Trajan advances against Parthia.		Commodus makes an ignominious peace with the Sarmatians and returns to Rome.
115	Devastating earthquake at Antioch.	180-183	Commodus leaves the government to his father's ministers and plunges into private dissipation.
	Trajan crosses the Tigris.	188	Indic: Vasudeva, Kushan emperor (to 190).
118	Trajan captures Ctesiphon; but insurrections on his rear compel him to retire.	188	Plot to kill Commodus discovered. Henceforth he acts as a panic-stricken tyrant. Power of the favourite Perennis.
117	Trajan dies at Selinus in Cilicia.	189	Fall of Perennis. Power of Cleander.
	Hadrian (Marcus Aelius Hadrianus) emperor.	189	Fall of Cleander.
	Hadrian reverts to the policy of non-expansion, and makes peace with Parthia.	192	Assassination of Commodus.
118	Partial withdrawal from Dacia.		Pertinax made emperor by the Praetorians (first of the 'praetorian emperors').
	Hadrian returns to Rome, and makes preparation for his 'peregrination' of the Empire. (The dates of the itinerary are uncertain.)	193	Pertinax murdered by the Praetorians, who offer the throne to the highest bidder, and force the Senate to accept the purchaser, Didius Julianus.
120	Hadrian in Britain. Construction of Hadrian's Wall from the Solway to the Tyne.		Pescennius Niger commanding in Syria, Clodius Albinus in Britain and Septimius Severus in Illyria declare against the usurper. While Pescennius is in arms in the East, Severus marches on Rome as the avenger of Pertinax, crushes Julianus, and is proclaimed emperor.
	India: Probable date of the Kushan monarch Kanishka, 120-162.		Severus, emperor, disbands the Praetorians, but makes large concessions to his own troops.
121	Hadrian in Gaul. In the next ten years he visits in succession Spain, Africa, Syria, Asia (Minor), Greece, where he makes a long stay at Athens; returns to Rome; again visits Carthage, Athens and Antioch, and in the East confirms the Parthian Peace.	194	Severus recognizes Albinus as Caesar, but marches against Pescennius.
121	Hadrian at Alexandria.		Defeat and death of Pescennius. His followers hold out for two years at Byzantium.
123	Last organized revolt of the Jews, and their final dispersion.	197	Contest of Severus and Albinus, who is defeated and slain at the sanguinary battle of Lugdunum (Lyons).
124	Hadrian at Rome.	198	Severus organizes a new Praetorian Guard under his own command, whose prefect is in fact, the civilian First Minister. The administration is directed by the prefect Plautianus, an eminent lawyer.
125	Hadrian nominates his worthless favourite Verus as his successor.	201	Parthian campaign of Severus.
127	Verus dies, leaving a child, Lucius Verus.	203	Fall and execution of Plautianus; who is succeeded as prefect by the lawyer Papinian. Development of the legal doctrine of Autocracy.
128	Hadrian adopts a distinguished Senator, Titus Aurelius Antoninus (Pius), aged fifty-two.	208	Severus in Britain. Costly campaigns in Caledonia. Building of the Wall of Severus.
	Antoninus adopts his own nephew, Marcus Annius Verus (Marcus Aurelius Antoninus) and Lucius Verus.	210	Bassianus and Geta, sons of Severus, with the army in Britain.
	Death of Hadrian.	211	Death of Severus. Joint succession of his sons Caracalla (Bassianus) and Geta. They return to Rome.
	Antoninus Pius emperor.		
138-161	Reign of Antoninus Pius. An era of wholly uneventful tranquillity and prosperity; but it encouraged barbarians on the borders to believe that the Empire was losing vitality.		
	Ptolemy (astronomer and geographer) and Arrian the historian of Alexander the Great flor.		
161	Death of Antoninus Pius.		
	Marcus Aurelius, emperor, makes Lucius Verus his colleague.		
169	India: Huvishka succeeds Kanishka as Kushan king.		
168	Parthian incursions.		

## NOTE ON THE MAP OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

IN the map shown in facing this page we have a comprehensive view of the Roman Empire at its greatest extent under Trajan—substantially greater than under Augustus and somewhat greater than under Trajan's successor, Hadrian. For Hadrian, deciding on a return to the more cautious policy of Augustus, abandoned Armenia and Trajan's conquests east of the Euphrates; though the statement that he also abandoned Dacia in any real sense is certainly untrue. The inset below clarifies the frontier problems in Germany (see pages 1983-85): Augustus first contemplated the Danube-March-Elbe line, but dissuaded by the defeat of Varus by Arminius left back to the Rhine; this, however, left an awkward salient between the head-waters of the Rhine and Danube (the Black Forest), and it was found necessary to bite off the salient by the construction of the 'limes Germaniae', completed by Trajan. The inset above shows the distances separating, the trade routes connecting, and the relative sizes of the Roman Empire, the Chinese Empire (or sphere of influence) and the area of Indian civilization. The second was now at the height of its power under the Hans, but the third during this period had no political cohesion; the Kushan kings (see Chap. 49) ruled most of the north from Peshawar, while the only other important power was the Andhra dynasty with its origin in the far south.





## Chronicle XI

# THE EMPIRE IN ITS GRANDEUR:

A.D. 98—211

THE majesty of the Roman Empire was at its zenith under the four rulers who followed Nerva, from A.D. 98 to 180: Trajan the embodiment of clear-eyed strength and justice; Hadrian the man of genius; Antoninus Pius the peace-lover; Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, who may dispute with Asoka the claim to represent the Platonic ideal of the philosopher sovereign. Of the four, only the first yielded to the temptation of conquest, though the last found himself compelled to engage, not over successfully, in heavy frontier warfare. All devoted themselves primarily to the development of the welfare of the Empire as a whole, and the era, commonly known as the 'Age of the Antonines,' is justly accounted the golden age of the Roman Empire.

### First of the Antonine Emperors

TRAJAN—Marcus Ulpius Trajanus—A.D. 98—117, was chosen by Nerva as his successor because in the circumstances it was essential that Caesar should command the confidence and the obedience of the army from the outset, and in Trajan he saw a man of sterling character and high ability who had spent half his life in military service and enjoyed the trust of all who knew him.

Trajan made no haste to celebrate his accession. His work on the Rhine frontier had first to be completed, a work not of conquest but of strategic fortification. He was, besides, more at home in the camp than in the city. His letters to the Senate, however, were of good augury, promising that in his reign no senator should be put to death arbitrarily, and flatly declining for himself the divine honours proffered during his life.

When in due time he left his legions and came to Rome, the good impression was fully confirmed and he achieved immediate popularity by the frank simplicity and

sincerity of his manners, and his fearless confidence in the loyalty of those who surrounded him: a confidence which, so far as his personal safety was concerned, he did not hesitate to carry to what seemed to be the extreme of rashness. The atmosphere of suspicion was allayed, the more when Trajan's judgement was justified by the event, and the tongues of delators and scandalmongers were silenced instead of being encouraged. Nor was there in Trajan's simplicity any such failure of dignity as had in some degree marred the character of Vespasian.

### Reorganization of the Finances

THOUGH he found the finances of the state in very bad order, he entirely declined to replenish the treasury and the privy purse either by heavy taxation or by the familiar expedients of arbitrary confiscations and fines. The need for economy was met by the curtailment of extravagances, not only in the imperial household but in public departments, the stopping of leakages, the development of a graded civil service in which advancement was the reward of efficiency and dishonesty did not pay. Economists might be alarmed when the emperor refused the 'voluntary' contributions which it had been customary to accord, not from good will but from policy—a variant of the 'benevolences' whose exaction became so serious a grievance at one period of English history. Interests might clamour over the suppression of monopolies which brought money into the treasury; but the abolition of these things removed burdens that checked the development of trade and therefore of the sources of revenue, and the revenue itself increased instead of diminishing.

With increased revenue came an expenditure on public works, especially on means of communication, roads and ports,



TRAJAN, ROMAN EMPEROR

Marcus Ulpius Trajanus, born at Ithica, near Seville, c. A.D. 52, succeeded Nerva in A.D. 98. His high character and military talents were matched by his administrative ability, and the Empire was admirably governed by him.

*The Louvre; photo, Altinari*

which again increased trade and revenue. The result of all of which was that in the long run no reign left more splendid and convincing monuments of public wealth and prosperity than that of Trajan, paid for without any undue pressure of taxation either in Italy or in the provinces.

Trajan, moreover, imbued the provincial government with his own spirit. He chose for governors men of the best type, who were almost too anxious to seek his sympathetic counsel, which he was ready to give whenever it was asked, counsel always directed to the welfare of

the governed. The correspondence which passed between the emperor and his fervent admirer, the younger Pliny, whom he had sent as governor to Bithynia in 103, is typical—but it is unnecessary to give details here as the matter is very fully treated in Chapter 80.

Great as were the services rendered to the Empire by Trajan as an administrator, he probably set more store by his renown as a conqueror, since he was a soldier by instinct and a ruler by force of circumstance. Yet by common consent his military achievements were of no lasting advantage and were far from being an unqualified success. That is no reproach to his great qualities as a soldier, but it does mark the defect in his statesmanship, the adoption of an aggressive policy of expansion for the Empire.

In pursuance of that policy, he carried the Roman arms across the Danube in the campaigns of 101-106, and over the Euphrates in those of 114-117, discarding the principle recommended by Augustus from which the only departure during the last century had been the conquest of Britain under Claudius. The event may be taken as proving that Augustus was right and Trajan was wrong; the more confidently because that was emphatically the verdict of Trajan's successor Hadrian, the most brilliant in the whole line of Roman emperors unless we include the mighty Julius in the list.

#### 'Forward Policy' in Dacia

**B**UT so far at least as Dacia is concerned, Trajan was not without warrant in his calculation that the policy was sound when he embarked upon it. It corresponded very closely to what was known two generations ago as the 'forward policy' on the British-Afghan frontier in India. The mass, if not perhaps the weight, of military opinion, conscious of menace from incalculable powers at a distance, called for farther-flung outposts of the Empire, the alternative being a buffer state which might prove to be not a buffer but an enemy advance-guard.

The population of Dacia (which corresponded roughly to modern Hungary and Rumania) in Trajan's time was doubtless

## The Empire in its Grandeur

heterogeneous, probably mainly Slavonic. Six centuries earlier, the great Darius had plunged into those wild regions, and barely succeeded in extricating himself and a remnant of his army from the wilderness. The Illyrian hills and the Balkans were a permanent barrier which held back the Mediterranean peoples even from the Danube, till the Romans in the time of Augustus set about the reduction of Moesia and Pannonia. But now within the last twenty years the Dacian chief Decebalus had been welding the trans-Danube tribes into some sort of unity, had crossed the Danube and raided Roman territory, and had so dealt with the punitive legions of Domitian that the Roman prestige in those quarters had fallen to a very low ebb.

It is scarcely surprising, then, that a soldier, conscious of his powers, should have deemed that the time had come for discarding the prudent policy of Augustus

in favour of that which would certainly have been adopted by Julius. Something more was wanted here than the organization of the forces and the fortresses on the Rhine and Rhine-to-Danube frontier, the work, admirably accomplished, on which Trajan had been engaged when called upon to assume the principate.

From the moral point of view there was justification enough for bringing the Dacian monarch severely to book; his activities, encouraged by his experience of Domitian, were emphatically provocative. In 101, therefore, Trajan organized his first Dacian expedition, on which he was accompanied by the young kinsman Publius Aelius Hadrianus (A.D. 76-138), whom he chose later to be his imperial successor. The campaign taxed heavily the strategic powers of Trajan and the discipline of his troops; the more because Decebalus was an astute prince who understood how to gain time by diplomacy, and also had a thorough knowledge,




### GLORIFICATION OF TRAJAN AS PUBLIC BENEFACTOR

Two of Trajan's popular benefactions to the state are commemorated in these reliefs on the balustrades in the forum that bears his name. In the upper relief he is depicted in the curule chair with Italia, a child in her arms, thanking him for the institution of the 'alimenta,' state charities expected to arrest the depopulation of Italy. On the other balustrade he is shown witnessing the fulfilment of his order for the burning of the records of arrears of taxes owing by the provincials.

*Photos, Anderson*





Seven scenes illustrate the successful conclusion of the First Dacian War. In this one we see Trajan surrounded by his officers and his guards with their victorious standards held proudly erect, receiving the submission of the Dacians. Decabalus, their chieftain, kneels at his feet with hands upraised in supplication; opposite him are two attendant barbarian nobles on their knees; and in front of the emperor is a group of standing prisoners and a long line of kneeling suppliant Dacians.



It was in March, A.D. 101, that Trajan left Rome for his first campaign against the Dacians. The chronicle on his column begins with scenes of military activity on the Danube and of the Roman army leaving Viminacium and crossing the river in two divisions, Trajan being in command of the western army. This scene shows the emperor at the head of his division, standing just outside the camp on the far side of the river, with cavalry and infantry, spearmen and trumpeters behind.

#### EPISODES OF THE FIRST DACIAN WAR RECORDED ON TRAJAN'S COLUMN

From Cichorius, 'Die Trajanssäule,' G. Reimer, Berlin

## The Empire in its Grandeur

which the Roman had not, of the extremely difficult country in which the campaign must be fought. But when, after very hard fighting, Trajan had forced the pass still known as the Iron Gates, the ultimate victory of the Romans was assured. When his capital was captured, Decebalus made humble terms of submission (102); but Trajan's back was

in his forum the mighty monument known as Trajan's Column, and to abide in peace till in 113 affairs in the East again awakened his military ambitions.

The Euphrates had long been the vaguely acknowledged boundary between the Roman and Parthian dominions, but both empires claimed the northern kingdom of Armenia as a dependency. The



### DEATH OF DECEBALUS ON THE FIELD OF BATTLE

As shown in the relief opposite Decebalus made humble submission to Trajan at the end of the first Dacian War; but he soon resumed hostilities and Trajan again took the field. He crossed the Danube at the modern Turnu Severin, forced the passes, occupied Sarmizegetusa, the Dacian capital, and completely defeated Decebalus who, despairing but defiant to the last, threw himself from his horse and took his own life. After his death Dacia was completely subdued and made a Roman province.

*From Cichorius, 'Die Traianssäule,' G. Reimer, Berlin*

hardly turned before his diplomacy was at work, raising a fresh confederacy.

So in 103 Trajan again took the field, bent this time not merely on asserting the power of the Empire but on crushing the Dacian once and for all time. The Danube was spanned by a mighty bridge, of which probable remnants may be traced to this day; at three different points the passes were forced; and the kingdom of Decebalus was destroyed in 104. Roman legionaries were planted as colonists in the depopulated region of Transylvania, and in 106 the conqueror returned to Rome, after completing the settlement, to raise

Arsacid dynasty was in decline, but had not abated its claims, and here Trajan found his excuse for what was in fact a project of conquering expansion; for the Parthian monarch Chosroes presumed to set a kinsman of his own on the throne of Armenia. So in 113 Trajan set his armies in motion and proceeded to the East to take the command in person.

On the way he was met by ambassadors praying for peace. Chosroes had taken alarm, set up a new prince, Parthamasiris, in Armenia, and offered his protégé's homage. This was not enough. Trajan advanced, meeting no resistance, till he

reached the borders of Armenia. Then Parthamasiris humiliated himself and came in person to the emperor, but only to be told that Armenia was no longer a kingdom but a Roman province, and he had leave to depart. The circumstances in which he was slain almost immediately afterwards are obscure, but certainly could not reflect credit on Trajan.



Armenia with Mesopotamia was secured, but Parthia was the emperor's real objective. Operations, however, were delayed till 116 owing to the need for creating some organization, and then to the havoc wrought by a terrific earthquake at Antioch, in which Trajan himself barely escaped with his life. Then came a great campaign over the Tigris, the passage of which in the face of an active foe was no easy task, and the advance to Susa, the last triumphant achievement.

For in rear of the victorious armies revolt broke out in all the annexed territories. Trajan was obliged to retreat by the enemy behind him, not in front of him—and his own health, of which he was unsparing at sixty-four as at forty, had at

last broken down. He was indeed only checked, not defeated; but he saw at least that his dream of emulating Alexander could never be accomplished, and even the widespread revolts were still unquelled when he turned his face homeward and died on the way in Cilicia (117).

Trajan had found, and named (though only on his death-bed), his fit successor, in Hadrian, the cousin, now commanding in Syria, whose capacities he had gauged in spite of the most marked contrasts between their characters. Scandal, wholly without foundation, whispered that the new emperor owed his selection to the favour in which he had always stood with Trajan's empress Plotina, who sent the dead man's instructions to the Senate.

**HADRIAN** (Publius Aelius Hadrianus) was now forty years of age. His family, of north-Italian origin, had long been settled, like that of Trajan, in Spain. His father had been a near cousin of Trajan, who had constituted himself the boy's guardian. He was brilliantly clever and amazingly versatile; and had accom-



TRAJAN'S COLUMN IN ITS ORIGINAL SETTING AND AS IT IS TO-DAY

The Column of Trajan was set up in the open space contained between the façade of the Basilica Ulpia and the wings of the library facing the Temple of Trajan. The column, including the base, is 127 feet high and is encircled by spiral reliefs forming a continuous narrative of the Dacian wars. The column still stands, amid fragments of the surrounding colonnades (right), but Trajan's statue on the summit was replaced in the sixteenth century by one of S. Peter.



**TRAJAN'S CONSORT PLOTINA**

Pompeia Plotina, wife of the Emperor Trajan, had no children, and willingly communicated to the Senate her husband's deathbed nomination of Hadrian as his successor. After her death Hadrian built a temple in her honour.

*Capitoline Museum, Rome*

panied the emperor on his campaigns, sometimes holding high command, in which he had acquitted himself with credit. He had just been placed in charge of Syria, and no one can have been surprised when at the last Trajan nominated him to the succession.

Trajan was a man of a grand simplicity, who set before himself and acted upon a noble conception of his high duties and responsibilities. He might be said to have been almost the perfect type of the traditional Roman character at its best; devoted to the service of the state of which he was lord; magnanimous, self-reliant, clear-eyed, just, fearless, entirely practical; a little too contemptuous of intellectual subtleties, a little lacking in imagination, too prone to assume the point of view of the professional soldier.

Hadrian was as complex as Trajan was simple, of a type more readily associated with the Greek than with the Roman, suggestive perhaps of a Celtic element in his ancestry. Endowed with an immensely wider intellectual range than Trajan, he was eager in the pursuit of beauty, still more eager in the pursuit of knowledge, and possessed all the imagination which Trajan lacked, while himself lacking the intensity of Trajan's moral conviction; yet he held ideals of empire not perhaps more noble but more penetrating and less conventional, or at least less traditional. His military talents were probably not small, and apparently he had shown marked courage in the field, but he was not, as Trajan was, a born soldier called to be a statesman, but a statesman who could on occasion prove himself an able soldier; and conquest for the sake of conquest had no attraction for him.

The statesman in Hadrian was swift to realize that for the Roman Empire conquest was not statesmanship. With a frontier which could hold any attack at bay, nothing was to be feared from



**HADRIAN, ROMAN EMPEROR**

Publius Aelius Hadrianus was born at Rome A.D. 76, and was brought up by his kinsman Trajan, whose great-niece, Julia, he married. Hadrian's reign, A.D. 117-138, was one of the happiest periods in Roman history.

*Valican: photo, Andersen*

barbarians only half organized at their best; nothing was to be gained by routing them in the field or occupying their territory. With the old boundaries the Empire was large enough to tax the organizing abilities of any government to the utmost. Hadrian discarded all designs of expansion, and deliberately abandoned the recent conquests beyond the Euphrates. Chosroes of Parthia, in whose place Trajan had set up a puppet of his own, was reinstated.

In 118 Hadrian returned to Rome. His reversal of Trajan's policy was of course resented by the advocates of aggressive imperialism, and posterity accused him of abandoning Dacia as well as Trans-Euphrates; but this seems to be sufficiently disproved by the permanence of the Latin or Roman element in Tran-



**HADRIAN AS ARCHITECT AND PONTIFF**

Hadrian had so practical a knowledge of architecture that he himself designed the double temple of Venus and Roma erected by him north of the Sacra Via. This fragment of one of the pediments shows the emperor attended by lictors passing before the temple on his way to its dedication.

*Lateran Museum, Rome; photo, Anderson*

sylvania. The broad fact stands that he preferred a consolidated frontier to indefinite expansion.

Hadrian reigned for twenty-one years (117-138) and a very large proportion of that time was occupied in peregrinations of the Empire, every part of which he visited in person at one time or other, becoming thoroughly acquainted with the prevailing conditions and local diversities, and making his hand felt in organization and government. In Britain, 'Hadrian's Wall' from Solway to Tyne confirmed the permanent effective military frontier of the Roman province, while the northern line of forts served as a screen to hold the Picts of the Caledonian Highlands in check, the main wall being practically one extended fortress.

The visit to Britain was the first of Hadrian's expeditions to the remote provinces after his return from Dacia, which had demanded his immediate attention. The special characteristics of the island in its relation to the Empire will be found more fully set forth in Chapter 77; but we may remark here that as concerns Hadrian its treatment was typical. The province proper was to be thoroughly organized and controlled; its frontiers were to be made impregnably secure by a fortress-barrier which could neither be penetrated nor outflanked; the country beyond was not to be subjugated.



**HADRIAN AMONG HIS PEOPLE**

This relief is one of a pair that decorated an arch that spanned the Via Lata, south of the Ara Pacis. It shows Hadrian (head wrongly restored) making a proclamation to the Roman people, represented by males of varying ages.

*Palazzo dei Conservatori; photo, Alinari*

## The Empire in its Grandeur

and occupied, but sufficiently garrisoned to discourage tribal concentrations.



Within the province, the army of occupation consisted of the legions of Roman citizens recruited from the provinces (only the praetorians being recruited in Italy) with their complements of auxiliary cohorts from Dacia or other distant parts of the Empire. But the tendency was for both legions and cohorts to remain continuously, for the men to take native wives, and for their sons to follow the father's profession, while there was nothing to prevent the cohorts from being locally recruited. The intention had been to prevent the recurrence of such military insurrections as that of Civilis on Vespasian's accession; but in actual practice it can hardly be doubted that a generation or two sufficed to convert what had been and still was nominally a foreign into a native cohort. And the result of this was that the army in each province tended to develop a sort of provincial patriotism, and jealousy of the armies of other provinces; while the common and distinctive Roman citizenship of the legionaries preserved in all the armies a sense of imperial unity

without distinction of race. The danger of provincial patriotism lay no longer in the old desire to break away from Rome's alien rule, but in a new ambition to be a dominating force within the Empire.

This, however, was not yet to manifest itself. Unification and consolidation were at the root of Hadrian's conception; they would not be forwarded by war and expansion, but security was necessary, and military efficiency was necessary to security; therefore Hadrian the man of peace was as zealous as Trajan himself to maintain his armies at the highest pitch of efficiency. There was no depreciation of the majesty of Rome, but to him Rome meant the whole Empire, not, as to those before him, the imperial city.

### Hadrian's Energy and Ability

SPAIN, Africa, Syria, Egypt, were all visited in turn, and no little time was spent by Hadrian in Greece and especially at Athens, the academic home of his spiritual affinities. The histories have no events of consequence to record; but evidently the Roman world was immensely impressed by an amazing activity which



CASTEL SANT' ANGELO, HADRIAN'S WAR-SCARRED MAUSOLEUM

About the year A.D. 130 Hadrian built a mausoleum beside the Tiber to contain the ashes of himself and his descendants. The reconstruction (left) shows that it consisted of two diminishing circular structures surrounded by pillars, set on a square base and surmounted by a conical roof. In the seventh century the church of S. Angelus Inter Nubes was built upon its summit and later it became a papal fortress, the history of which would be an epitome of the history of medieval Rome.


it did not understand, but which conveyed at every turn unexpected originality as well as a versatility rare indeed among Romans; in fact, Romans of the old tradition probably found their emperor rather alarmingly clever and unconventional. But as concerned the business of government, his cleverness was convincingly practical. Probably it was Hadrian himself who incited the eminent jurist Salvius Julianus to make that codification of legal decisions, known as Hadrian's Perpetual Edict, which practically amounted to a much needed code of Equity. We cannot but regret that we have not a more complete knowledge of a character and a genius so brilliant and so complex.

Only in the last years of his strenuous and exhausting life—he was sixty-two when he died—did his powers and his self-mastery show signs of failing; he began to display an unhappy vindictiveness, and his first choice of a successor was Aelius Verus, a youth who had no particular qualifications other than a handsome person. Happily he soon died, and Hadrian adopted in his place a senator of mature years and distinguished character, Titus Aurelius Antoninus, of whose virtues the Senate expressed its appreciation by giving him the title Pius. By some curious caprice, Hadrian also required Antoninus to adopt a youth of the highest promise, Marcus Annus Verus (121-180), whom the world remembers as Marcus Aurelius, and at the same time Lucius, the very young son of Aelius Verus.

Hadrian was the victim of a mortal disease, which may at least help to account for the capricious cruelty he displayed at the close, and only at the close, of his life. A year after the adoption he was dead, and Antoninus Pius was emperor (138-161).

The twenty-three years of the reign of Antoninus are almost recordless. On barbarian frontiers occasional military movements were inevitable, but even there Antoninus preferred conciliation to coercion. His was a reign of peace still more complete than that of his predecessor. If a nation is happiest when it has least history, and has least history when it is happiest, the Roman world was assuredly never happier than in the days of Antoninus Pius, who in 161 ended a blameless life with an honoured death.

More troubled was the reign of his successor Marcus Aurelius, a born student, called unwillingly by his overpowering sense of duty to be a man of action. If fate had been kinder to him, his reign would have been a repetition of that of Antoninus. Obeying the call not of inclination but of duty, he had been constant in the practice



ANTONINUS PIUS

Titus Aurelius Antoninus (A.D. 86-165) was adopted by Hadrian, whom he succeeded in A.D. 138 with the official title of Antoninus Pius. Equity and justice flourished under his sway.

Vatican; photo, Alinari

of public functions whilst his heart was in the pursuit of abstract truth; he had in full measure the moral qualities demanded in an ideal ruler; but the special problems he had to face needed perhaps a keener insight than his, and his difficulties were increased by one defect—his blindness to the deficiencies in those whom he loved and unwisely trusted. To say that he was a failure would be a gross injustice; but he made mistakes which in the long run had most unhappy consequences.

Marcus Aurelius (161-180) on his accession—a highly popular event, for he was already justly credited with all the virtues of Antoninus—of his own choice shared the imperial authority with his younger adoptive brother, Lucius Verus, whose principal merit was his ready deference to and respect for Marcus. The troops had known the vigour of Hadrian but had never felt the hand of

## The Empire in its Grandeur.

the mild Antoninus, and the legions in distant Britain were eager to raise their own chief, Statius Priscus, to the purple, but he was too stoutly loyal to be tempted. The mutiny collapsed; but it was not without ill omen for the future, and even at the moment was a symptom of general uneasiness on the frontiers. The peace of Antoninus had been purchased at some cost to the discipline of the armies, and to the fear those armies had been wont to inspire beyond the frontiers.

### Outbreak of War with Parthia

THE fact was already being exemplified in the East. Parthia once more asserted her claim to Armenia; Parthian forces poured over the border and threatened Syria, a region always destructive to the discipline of the troops quartered there unless under officers of the school of Vespasian and Trajan. Hadrian had everywhere maintained very strict army discipline; Antoninus had no doubt neglected it, being himself no soldier. In Syria it was now very indifferently enforced. For two centuries and more it might be said that only Ventidius Bassus and Trajan had been able to win laurels in conflict with the Parthians—at any rate to give decisive proof of the superiority of the Roman over the Parthian arms. Now Roman prestige in the East was so threatened as to call for the emperor's presence.

Marcus had no craving for the laurels of the conqueror. Officially the supreme command for the Parthian war was taken by Verus, who remained for the most part ingloriously at Antioch, the most cosmopolitan, the most luxurious, and the most depraved of the cities of the Empire. The work of organizing and campaigning was carried out by the subordinates who had been chosen for their efficiency, Priscus, who was summoned from Britain, and Cassius Avidius, sternest of disciplinarians and an able soldier to boot. But some five years of hard campaigning were needed before Parthia would submit to the terms by which she surrendered her title in Mesopotamia and Armenia. Verus claimed the credit, and the name of Parthicus, for what not he but the

generals had done; but he had the grace to insist that the reluctant Marcus must share his honours.

But the Parthian war (161-165) was only a prelude. On the upper Danube the German Quadi and Marcomanni were threatening, and the return of Verus with the troops from the East was attended by a tremendous outbreak of the plague in Italy which delayed the necessary operations. Marcus, disciple of Epictetus and the Stoics as he was, was not free from the conviction that the thing was a visitation, a punishment sent by the gods for some flaw of sacrilege in the state; and to this superstition may well be attributed the severe persecution of the Christians, who had enjoyed almost complete immunity under Hadrian and Antoninus, which he set on foot; for Stoicism was punctilious in its regard for religious observances.

In 167 Marcus took the field in company with Verus. The demonstration, however, sufficed to bring the Quadi to terms without fighting. In 168 the emperors were able to return in peace; but Marcus was relieved of one embarrassment by the



THE PHILOSOPHER KING

Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 121-180), who succeeded Antoninus Pius in A.D. 161, represents the Platonic ideal philosopher king and the highest pre-Christian conception of character. His Meditations are his imperishable monument

British Museum





MARCUS AURELIUS IMPERATOR

This bold and spirited piece of sculpture is one of the very few ancient equestrian statues in bronze still extant, its preservation being largely due to a mistaken idea in the Middle Ages that it was a statue of Constantine. Traces of gold on the horse's head show that originally it was gilt.

Capitol, Rome

death of his colleague, and henceforth he reigned alone.

The pacification, however, was illusory. The trans-Danubian peoples were in ferment, not on the upper Danube only. Year after year was occupied with conscientious campaigning which the emperor would not shirk, however uncongenial he found it, since it fell within the range of his responsibilities as he conceived them; though he was under no illusion as to his own very mediocre abilities as a general, and trusted more in the military judgement of his officers than in his own. Once—it is piously recorded on his Column at Rome—he and his troops, cut off in the passes from their supplies,

were only saved by a timely deluge from perishing of thirst (see illustration in page 1931). Disaster was escaped, and when the enemy could be brought to an engagement they were defeated; but the mobility of the barbarians made all such campaigning harassing, hazardous and inconclusive.

Marcus was on his way to the East in 175 to suppress a revolt headed by Cassius Avidius, when news came that the rising was over; the rebel had been slain by his own soldiers. With a rare magnanimity the emperor forbade all punishment of his family or his adherents, and destroyed unread all incriminating documents. Before returning to Rome he passed through his eastern dominion; and when he did return it was no long time before he was again called to the Danube frontier. On this occasion his arms proved more unequivocally successful; but the campaign was not yet finished when he was struck down by sickness, and died, worn out by his labours, in the sixtieth year of his age (A.D. 180).

All men united in praising the emperor, whose one aim had always been the welfare of his people, and who had constantly sacrificed all his own natural inclinations and predilections to toil unremittently at the task which had been laid upon him. The worst that could be said of him was that the sternness he should have shown towards defaulters was too exclusively reserved for himself; that for others he was too ready, even too anxious, to find excuse and to shut his eyes to their failings. Under him, as under Antoninus, the standard of civil administration was admirable. And in a corrupt society the personal example that these two emperors set was above praise.

## The Empire in its Grandeur

But Marcus did not deal successfully with the growing problem of frontier defence, since he was naturally incapable of the vigorous measures necessary. That is the sum of the failure of the philosopher sovereign, save that he also failed in that he nominated his son Commodus as his successor, and that he misread Christianity.

**COMMODUS** (180-192) had been born in the year of his father's accession. Now, at twenty, he was an ill-conditioned youth whose education had been excellent in theory and ineffective in practice. He was accepted with anxiety, no doubt, but without opposition. He had been on the last campaign and was left in active command; but fighting under difficulties was not to his taste, and instead of carrying the war through he promptly made an ignominious peace—which confirmed the conviction of the hostile tribes that the day of Roman supremacy was past—and returned to give himself up to private dissipations while he left the uncongenial business of the administration in the hands of his tutors.



### LARGESSE TO THE POPULACE

Seated on a raised platform Marcus Aurelius is here depicted assisting at the distribution of the 'congiarium' or largesse to the Roman people—represented by four figures below—after his return from the trans-Danubian campaign.

*Abbie of Arch of Constantine.*



### TRIUMPH OF MARCUS AURELIUS OVER THE GERMANS AND SARMATIANS

These are two of a number of panels that adorned a public monument in honour of Marcus Aurelius. Most of the series were afterwards incorporated in the Arch of Constantine, whose head, as in the top panel, was substituted for the original. Here, the reliefs in their unaltered state give contemporary portraits of Marcus Aurelius: on the left, riding among his guards and acknowledging the submission of barbarian chieftains, and, right, as 'triumphator' before the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.

*Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome: photos, Anderson*

Then the fundamental weakness of the position developed. The personal character of the last two emperors compelled a respect and admiration which safeguarded them in spite of a gentleness which amounted to weakness. The young emperor had neither force nor elevation of character nor intelligence. Plots were formed against him; they were discovered and suppressed; but he took alarm, and panic transformed him from a fainéant debauchee into a tyrant who alternated between raising worthless favourites to power and surrendering them to the enemies they excited. His tyranny was directed against persons, not his subjects generally, while he kept the city mob in good humour by a degrading participation in the public contests of the arena conducted on a lavish scale, though always with due regard for his personal safety.

For such a reign, the inevitable end was assassination at the hands of alarmed members of the tyrant's own disreputable household. In 193 Commodus was duly murdered, with the connivance of the prefect of the praetorians, Laetus, who was ready with an eminently respectable candidate for the purple, a senator named Pertinax; whose nomination, thus supported, was accepted by the Senate.

**P**ERTINAX opens the series of Caesars known as the Praetorian Emperors, who were raised to the purple by the praetorians or by the legions under their own command in the provinces, most of whom ruled only till ejected and killed by another soldier who seized the succession; men of every variety of nationality and birth—Moor, Illyrian, Gaul, Syrian, Arabian, even Roman. Now and then an emperor was



**VICTORIOUS ROMAN SOLDIERS CARRYING OFF PRISONERS AND BOOTY**

In A.D. 174 the Senate and Roman People erected a column to Marcus Aurelius which still stands in the Piazza Colonna. It is a repetition in Carrara marble of Trajan's column, 100 feet in height and surrounded by a continuous spiral band of reliefs representing the events of the Marcomannic Wars. The reliefs are wonderfully animated and have contributed greatly to modern knowledge of the conduct of military operations under the Empire.

*Photo, Anderson*

## The Empire in its Grandeur

strong enough or his adherents were strong enough to pass on the immediate succession to a son. But at the death of Commodus we have only a foretaste of the chaos ; because a strong man arose, Lucius Septimius Severus, who held the reins in his masterful grip from 193 to 211.

Pertinax, an old soldier, was made emperor by favour of the praetorians and their prefect. He lost that favour because, in a conscientious effort to rectify the misdeeds of Commodus and the evils which had sprung up during his rule, he tried to tighten discipline instead of relaxing it. Before Commodus had been three months dead, the praetorians mutinied, broke into the palace, murdered Pertinax, paraded his head through the streets on a pike, and offered the imperial throne to the highest bidder. The precarious prize fell to a wealthy senator, Didius Julianus.

At Rome the Guards could dictate at ease to the civilians, but the provincial armies had a preference for a chief of their own selection. The legions in Britain and on the Rhine chose Clodius Albinus, the army in Syria proclaimed Pescennius Niger, the troops on the Danube hailed Septimius Severus.

Rome was the necessary objective. Albinus was a sluggard, a glutton ; Pescennius was popular in the East, but the army stationed in the East had the least experience of fighting, and its discipline habitually went to pieces unless it was under command of a martinet like Cassius Avidius. Severus was a hard soldier at the head of hardened troops, and he was nearest to Rome. Neither Albinus nor Pescennius was ready to strike ; but Severus struck straight. He marched on Rome. Didius passed from empty fulminations



**WHOLESALE DECAPITATION OF CONQUERED GERMAN CHIEFTAINS**

As compared with the work of the Trajanic sculptors the reliefs on the column of Marcus Aurelius are more sympathetic in their interpretation of the tragedy of war. This is due to the disposition of the philosopher emperor, who acquiesced in the brutalities of conquest only from a sense of duty. The representation of a German acting as executioner of his own defeated kinsmen recalls the fact that in the Marcomannic Wars Marcus employed an unprecedented number of German auxiliaries.

*Photo, Anderson*



#### A DEGENERATE PRINCE

Lucius Commodus (A.D. 161-192) succeeded his father, Marcus Aurelius, in A.D. 180. Dissipated and lacking in intelligence, he degenerated into a capricious and merciless tyrant, incurring general hatred that led to his assassination.

*Capitoline Museum*

to equally vain offers of compromise. Severus ignored both. As he drew near, the praetorians, inexperienced in war, realized the uses of discretion and deserted to the veteran leader of hard-bitten veterans, who was quite ready to save time and trouble by making promises which he had no intention of keeping. No resistance was offered, Didius Julianus was executed, and the Senate declared Severus emperor. The praetorians were disgraced, and the force was reorganized as a vast bodyguard, fifty thousand strong, under the emperor's direct control (193).

Pescennius was described as the best of the three candidates; but as soldier he was no match for Severus, who elected to deal with him next, crushed him and killed him in a campaign in Asia Minor (194), and then returned to the west to dispose of the pretensions of Albinus. But to beat the better trained and harder troops of the north was a more difficult matter; and it was only after a heavy

and furiously contested battle, the issue of which was at one time extremely doubtful, at Lugdunum (Lyons), that Severus in 197 could feel himself the undisputed master of the Roman world, though his reign dates from 193.

All the previous Caesars or Augusti—the latter title was the higher, as it had always been reserved exclusively for the emperor himself, whereas the former was habitually bestowed on an emperor designate—had been of Roman or at least Italian descent, even when of families long settled in far-away provinces. Severus was the first of many who had no pretence to Roman ancestry. He was an African who might properly be called a Moor, a race which has given birth to not a few very able soldiers. He did not regard his position as fully established till he had



#### WEAKNESS MASKED AS STRENGTH

Commodus with the attributes of Hercules, whose reincarnation he pretended to be—lion's skin, club and apples of the Hesperides. It is a tribute to Roman art that we can still recognize the weak youth (top) in the bearded man.

*Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome; photo, Atinari*

## The Empire in its Grandeur

inspired a wholesome fear in the minds of the possibly disaffected by dooming several senators to death; since the rude soldier chosen by soldiers as a soldier was accepted with reluctance by a body which still looked upon itself as the supreme constitutional authority. Moreover, to the man of the camp the mildness of the Antonines would have seemed an encouragement to treason.

The one lesson was enough. No more armed legions and no assassins' daggers were turned against Severus, nor did he play the tyrant. The domestic administration he left to competent and trustworthy officials, spending his own time among the armies



### VICTIMS OF VAULTING AMBITION

This sardonyx cameo probably bears the heads of Didius Julianus, to whom the Empire was sold by auction after the murder of Pertinax, and his consort, Manlia Scantilla. On the arrival of Septimius Severus, whom the troops on the Danube had proclaimed emperor, Didius was executed, June 1, 193.

*British Museum*



### EMPEROR FOR THREE MONTHS

Publius Helvius Pertinax was the first of the 'Praetorian' emperors, raised to the throne by their legions. He incurred disfavour by his disciplinary reforms and was murdered March 28, A.D. 193, after reigning barely three months.

*British Museum*

on one or another frontier. Frontier policy was his chief concern, and the policy he followed was that of Hadrian.

In the years immediately before his accession he had held command on the most dangerous of all the Roman marches, the banks of the Danube, and had learnt that the Empire's need was defence, not aggression, but that the aggressively-minded barbarian must be kept in healthy awe of the Roman power. He was not far from being a barbarian himself. Grim, hard, and unscrupulous, with no touch of magnanimity, he was yet free from wanton cruelty or mere vindictiveness, and he ruled his empire as he ruled his troops. The method was effective so long as the man was there; it was the culmination of military autocracy; but it broke down when the man was gone, as it was bound to do unless he left in actual control an equally efficient successor.

Severus spent the last years of his life in Britain, where he completed the system of frontier fortification. The last password issued by the dying Antoninus fifty years before was 'Equanimity'; the last password of Severus was 'Work' (*laboremus*). Each was singularly expressive of the character of him who chose it, and of the quality of his rule. By unremitting



SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS

Lucius Septimius Severus (A.D. 146-211) was proclaimed emperor by his legions in Pannonia in A.D. 193. He was a born soldier—of African stock—and established himself on the throne as a military autocrat. Severus died at York.

*The Louvre*

hard work Severus restored and increased the security and prestige of the Empire, which were being sapped in the days of Commodus. But the desire to found a dynasty led him at the last to the very blunder into which Marcus Aurelius had been drawn away by a very different motive, and the succession passed (211) to his infamous son Bassianus, better known as Caracalla.

Vespasian, the Sabine soldier, had become emperor by very much the same process as Severus, the African soldier—as the successful captain among candidates whose rival claims could be decided only by the sword. But excepting the sons who followed him as a matter of course, the succeeding emperors previous to Pertinax had owed their elevation not to the army but to the Senate, nor had any of the line departed from the formal tradition

that the Senate was the sovereign body which had delegated its powers to the princeps. Severus hardly pretended to maintain the fiction, and the very eminent lawyers of his reign, Papinian and Ulpian, made a fundamental legal doctrine of the emperor's personal sovereignty. The constitutional theory of the Empire had in effect ceased to be tenable.

**I**N our last three chronicles, since the establishment of the Western Han dynasty in China and the fall of the Maurya empire in India about the beginning of the second century B.C., we have given no records of the Far East and central Asia beyond the Parthian area, owing to the scantiness of the material and the uncertainty of dates. We must now take up the tale again, in spite of its meagreness, omitting any detailed reference to China, which is fully studied in Chapter 75.





**SEVERUS AND HIS CONSORT JULIA DOMNA**  
Septimius Severus was still in private station when he married Julia Domna, daughter of Bassianus of Emesa. A beautiful and able woman, she had great influence over her husband, by whom she was the mother of Caracalla.

*From Bernoulli, 'Römische Ikonographie'*

## The Empire in its Grandeur

We saw Shih Hwang Ti building the Great Wall for the defence of the new Chinese empire against the incursions of the central Asian nomad hordes, the Hsiung-nu Mongols and the semi-Iranian Yueh-chih. The latter were then pushed westward to the Oxus and appear to have established themselves precariously among Sacae and other Scythians in this region, overrunning the Graeco-Bactrian kingdoms in the second century B.C. From them or from their princes emerges, somewhere in the first century A.D., the Kushan dominion, monarchy, or empire, which begins with Kadphises I, provisionally dated circa A.D. 40. For the last two centuries India had had no recoverable history. Kadphises, pushing down from Bactria through the Hindu Kush, apparently made himself master of Afghanistan and the Punjab. We find his son, Kadphises II, extending his dominions and at war with China under the Eastern Hans. The great figure of the dynasty is Kanishka, whose date, on which all the other dates


turn, is much disputed; but (probably in the second quarter of the second century A.D.) his sovereignty, with Peshawar or Kabul as its centre, was acknowledged over the north-west of India, Kashmir, Afghanistan and Chinese Turkistan. Remembering always that the dates are provisional and uncertain, it is presumed that the dynasty and the dominion came to an end somewhere about A.D. 220, when the Han dynasty ended in China and Parthia was passing from the outworn Arsacids to the vigorously aggressive sway of the Persian Sassanids. Of the rest of India we know little more than that powerful independent kingdoms had by this time grown up, notably the Kshaharata 'satraps' in the West (Gujarat), and the Andhras in the farther south.



**DIMINISHED GLORY OF THE ARCH OF SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS**  
The Arch of Severus was dedicated in A.D. 213 in memory of his victories in the Parthian campaign in A.D. 198-202. On the face towards the Forum, shown in detail above, are representations of Severus haranguing his troops, a defeat of the Parthians and a capture of a town by the Romans

*Above, from Reinach, 'Répertoire des reliefs romains'*





Lambaesis became the administrative centre of Numidia when the camp of the Third Legion Augusta was moved thither by Trajan or Hadrian. This is what remains of the Capitolium—the temple of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva, copied from the great temple of this triad on the Capitoline Hill at Rome.



Podium of the Temple of Saturn at Thuburbo Majus, given the status of a Roman colony either by Caesar or, more probably, by Augustus. The god was originally the Carthaginian Baal-Hamam (see page 1624); but his cult still survived in Roman times, when he was identified with the Roman god Saturn. Right: main entrance to Thermae at Leptis Magna.



North Africa's complete reversal of fortune—from including the richest provinces of the Roman Empire it became little more than a desert under Moslem rule—has made of it a veritable museum of Roman remains, to which we must turn in order to get an idea of what provincial cities were like in the early centuries of this era. Elsewhere the stones would have been torn asunder for building purposes. Immediately above, the colonnaded Forum of Cuicul, the modern Djemila, in Algeria.

#### NOBLE RUINS OF CITIES THAT REFLECTED ROMAN CULTURE IN AFRICA

*Photo of Leptis Magna, courtesy of Prof. F. Halbherr; Lambaesis from Goell, 'Monuments antiques de l'Algérie'*

# A ROMAN CITIZEN SURVEYS THE WORLD

What Men thought and knew of the Empire  
and other Lands in the Second Century A.D.

By HUGH LAST

Fellow and Lecturer in Ancient History, St. John's College, Oxford

IN A.D. 14, when his long life came to an end amid the lamentations of a grateful world, the emperor Augustus was assured already of a place in history such as few Romans could claim and none more justly than he. For close on half a century his energies had been devoted to the creation and development of a new governmental system, and before his death this life-work had been crowned with success. He had found the Empire threatened with a galloping decline; he had left it so strong that three more centuries passed before drastic doctoring was called for again.

At the outset of his career there had been opposition to face, and even when he died there were men left who regretted that the Republic was no more. The historian Tacitus dramatically puts into the mouths of his admirers and detractors the varied views which might be held of Augustus and of his services to Rome; and though the bulk of their remarks need no mention here, there is one which may be recalled. When his supporters gave credit to Augustus for leaving an empire which faced the world four-square, they were thinking of an achievement which could not be gainsaid. One of the foremost tasks in the Augustan programme was the establishment of an imperial frontier.

The centre of civilization, which in the earliest ages of recorded history had been in western Asia, had moved to the Mediterranean basin during the second millennium B.C. and there it remained until the Reformation. The frontiers of this region in some directions are provided by nature. On the west is the Atlantic Ocean, and on the south and south-east the deserts of Africa and Arabia make

military defence a matter of small importance. It is on the east and north that difficulties arise; but even in the north nature has traced a line. The Pyrenees and the Cevennes lead on to the main massif of the Alps, and thence the mountain line is continued along the eastern coast of the Adriatic to the Balkan block which extends almost to the Sea of Marmora.

For the Roman Empire, however, a simple acceptance of this line throughout its length was impossible. In Gaul the mountain screen was broken by the gap of Carcassonne—between Pyrenees and Cevennes—and by the Rhône valley, between Cevennes and Alps; and the part of Gaul which lay north of the natural barrier had been included in the Roman world by the great-uncle of Augustus, Julius Caesar. Again, the Balkan mountains penetrate deep into the Greek peninsula; and when Greece was made part of the Roman Empire a frontier had to be sought, not in the mountains themselves, but farther north. Thus the European frontier problem of Rome was to connect the North Sea with the Black Sea by a line which would include France and the Balkan block.

In the eastern section the Danube offered a line to which there was no obvious alternative, but to join the Danube to the North Sea was a problem of the greatest difficulty. If we place ourselves at a point on the Danube between Vienna and Budapest (see map in plate facing page 1962), there are two directions in which we may seek a military frontier running to the North Sea. It is possible to ascend the Danube to a point near its


**Problem of  
the Frontier**

source, where the Rhine flows less than twenty miles away, and then to follow the Rhine down to Rotterdam. Or, again, a line may be found running northwards into Bohemia by the valley of the March, and thence down the Elbe past Dresden, Magdeburg and Hamburg to Cuxhaven and the sea. Of these possible frontiers the former—the Rhine-Danube line—was attractive because it called for no advance into Germany beyond the Rhine, along which Roman arms had been planted already by Julius Caesar.

But to be set against this there were several disadvantages. In the first place, when a frontier was needed to connect Belgrade with the North Sea, the valleys of the Danube and Rhine formed a line of extravagant length. The distance by this route from Budapest on the Danube to the North Sea at Rotterdam is greater by more than two hundred miles than from Budapest through Bohemia and down the course of the Elbe to Cuxhaven. Nor was its excessive length the only drawback of the Rhine-Danube line. South of the Black Forest the Rhine turns through a

right angle; and here, if the river barrier is accepted, a salient of barbarian territory runs deep into the Roman world. For military reasons this was serious, because a wedge of unoccupied country driven thus into the Roman frontier had the effect of isolating from one another the military forces on the two arms of the angle. In a military sense the Rhine-Danube frontier might almost be described as not one line but two; and this fact, together with the length to which the frontier extended, made Rome ready to consider the alternative.

The alternative was the short straight line of the Danube and the Elbe—a frontier which had everything in its favour except that its establishment would demand a war to conquer the country between Rhine and Elbe. At the Elbe Augustus aimed, and his advance in this direction is a matter of momentous interest. If Leipzig had been a city of the Roman world, and if Berlin had been within a day's journey from the line garrisoned by Rome, the cultural, and also political, history of Europe would not



ROMANISED CITY ON THE DANUBE WITH QUAYS AND AMPHITHEATRE

Whatever the problems to be solved on the Rhine, the Danube was an obvious natural frontier of the Roman Empire; and so it remained, for much of its length, even after Trajan had added the province of Dacia. This relief from his column shows a city on the river, or its tributary the Save, in which Trajan had wintered (101-102); soldiers are loading a transport and the emperor and his staff are about to set out on the second campaign of the First Dacian War.

*From Cichorius, Die Traianssäule*

have been exactly what it is. The military operations, which opened in 12 B.C. under the direction of Nero Claudius Drusus, younger brother of the future emperor Tiberius, met with such signal success that for something like twenty years the greater part of western Germany lay under military occupation of Rome. All indications pointed to a permanent provincialisation of the country west of the Elbe, when suddenly in the summer of A.D. 9, at a time when the resources of Augustus were still suffering from the strain of a great revolt which had broken out in Austria three years before, a section of the German race under their hero Arminius (Hermann) destroyed three Roman legions in an engagement near Osnabrück, and with them their ill-starred general, P. Quinctilius Varus.

Thus Germany was lost; and with men scarce and his exchequer low Augustus—by this time an old man rising seventy-two—made no effort to regain it. He fell back on the Rhine, accepted a frontier whose back was broken by the angle of the Black Forest, and be-

**Final Frontier on the North** queathed to his successors a problem which was finally solved by biting off the head of the salient and joining Rhine to Danube by the shorter artificial line of the German 'limes.' So it was that in Europe—the region where to us at least the work of Rome has its highest interest—the frontier left by Augustus followed the coast of the Atlantic, the English Channel and the North Sea from Gibraltar to Rotterdam; thence it ran up the valley of the Rhine, and so, round the Black Forest, down the Danube to the Black Sea. Changes, of course, were made in time. Britain was invaded by Claudius in A.D. 43 and retained until the fifth century. Dacia, the region lying north of the Danube in the bow of the Carpathians, was added by Trajan. But in general it is true that on the continent of Europe direct Roman influence on later history is to be sought in those regions which lie west and south of the Rhine-Danube line.

On the southern shore of the Mediterranean the frontier problem was at its simplest. Along the whole stretch from the Atlantic coast to the borders of Egypt

the desert, though its distance from the sea varies greatly, provides a continuous defence against invasion from without. In these parts the task of Rome was only to keep order in the regions which lay between the desert and the coast and to prevent that disturbing infiltration of nomad tribes from the Sahara against which the French administration of North Africa has still to be on its guard. The whole Roman territory on the southern shore of the Mediterranean from the Atlantic to the western frontier of Egypt claimed as its permanent garrison only a single Roman legion, together with auxiliary units numbering little more than half those of the auxiliaries normally stationed in so small a province as Britain.

Then to the east came Egypt, where a somewhat larger army lay. Since the country was of importance both for the trade routes which ran through it towards India and for its value as a granary to Rome, no risks could be taken with its teeming population—a population which was not disposed in favour of Rome by the peculiar administrative system here adopted by Augustus. But, even so, the garrison of the country was small. Nature has done much to defend the valley of the Nile against attacks from east and west. Military danger, if it came at all, would come from the south—from the Nubian power of the Sudan or from the Aethiopians of Abyssinia, and to block the Nile valley against aggression from this direction was a simple task.

The most lively and most dangerous of the Roman frontiers was the frontier in Asia. From Port Said, where Asia and Africa meet, round by Syria and Asia Minor to Constantinople, and from Constantinople onwards to a point near Batum in the south-eastern corner of the Black Sea, the coast was wholly in the hands of Rome, but it was no easy matter to find a defensive line which would give effective protection to the coastal lands which Rome controlled. Nature here did less than usual to assist, and the difficulties of establishing an arbitrary frontier were increased by the political situation.

In Europe and Africa the frontier problems lay in regions where Rome's

opponents could scarcely be dignified with a more honourable name than 'tribes.' Compared with that of Rome their civilization was low and their political organization often rudimentary. This, of course, was not everywhere the case; the disaster which befell the legions of Varus in Germany in A.D. 9 is reminder enough that powerful combinations might challenge the Roman arms even during the lifetime of Augustus. But on the whole it remains true that the enemies whom Rome faced in Africa and Europe were peoples on whom she could impose her will; her task was merely to choose a frontier line, and hold it.

In Asia the position was very different; there, and there alone, Rome found herself in contact with another power which might demand the treatment of an equal. This was Parthia,

which gradually increased its influence at the expense of its Greek rivals until by 80 B.C. it had reunited the whole central section of the old Persian dominions (see pages 1586 and 1703).

At about this time the capital of the Parthian empire was fixed at Ctesiphon, and the western frontier of Parthia ran roughly along the Euphrates up to the point at which that river issues from the highlands of Armenia. In forming her defences against this Parthian power, Rome was helped to a certain extent by the configuration of the country. Palestine and southern Syria, at least, were protected by the desert which lies immediately to the east. But north of this, where the Euphrates flows within a hundred miles of the Gulf of Alexandretta, Rome and Parthia were face to face. The Romans had annexed Syria in 63 B.C. when the great Pompey had only just put down a pirate organization which had scourged the whole eastern Mediterranean for years. To prevent a recurrence of this plague, if for no other reason, Rome was compelled to control the entire coast line of Syria and south-eastern Asia Minor, and in Syria this could only be done by establishing a frontier on the Euphrates. There, across the river, Rome and Parthia met, and Syria acquired a military importance which made its governor one

of the most responsible officers in the Roman world.

To the north of Syria the Romans were faced by a problem even more difficult—the problem presented by the highlands of Armenia, due east of Asia Minor. Here the interests, both military and commercial, of Rome and Parthia clashed, in a region where circumstances combined to make permanent occupation by Rome a most unalluring task. The climate was one of atrocious severity in winter; the country was difficult in the extreme, and a military frontier in this region would be so far to the east as to make its control from Rome the reverse of easy. The policy of Pompey, which was followed by that of Augustus, had been to control Armenia through a puppet king set up by Rome; but time had proved this arrangement a failure. Parthia, too, claimed interests in the country, and was wont to regard the kings set up by Rome as fair game. Thus between Rome and Parthia, Armenia became a bone of contention, just as did Afghanistan in the nineteenth century between Great Britain and Russia.

The Armenian question is one which bulks large in the history of imperial Rome, but here it is only necessary to mention the two most important developments. **Solution of the Armenian problem** of the first century A.D. In Nero's principate Rome surrendered her claim to choose the Armenian king; in the principate of Vespasian the Roman frontier of the East was completed when the gap between the northern boundary of Syria and the Black Sea was filled by a permanent garrison quartered in Galatia and Cappadocia.

Thus from Gibraltar in the west the frontier ran by the coasts of the Atlantic and the English Channel to the mouth of the Rhine, and thence by Rhine and Danube to the Black Sea. From the Black Sea the line went south to the Euphrates and the Syrian desert; and in Africa, west of Egypt, the Sahara gave a natural protection to the coast-lands of the Mediterranean. Extension by Rome beyond these lines was rare. Apart from the frontier adjustments in Germany, the

only two cases of importance are those mentioned already. One is the invasion of Britain by Claudius (A.D. 43), the other the annexation of Dacia by Trajan (A.D. 106). For the rest, Rome was wisely content to conserve her strength.

On the west and south the frontiers were so strong as hardly to need defence, and it was because these regions made only the smallest claims on its military resources that an empire stretching from England to Egypt and from Syria to Spain was able to exist with an army of little more than 300,000 men. But if nature had been generous on south and west, she was less prodigal of help in Asia and central Europe. Though the Sassanid successors of the Parthian kings succeeded in capturing a Roman emperor (see page 2118), in Asia Rome managed generally to hold her own, even after the preaching of Mahomet had added religious fervour to the terror of enemies already strong. But in Europe the extended line from Rotterdam to the Black Sea called for a defence which became ever costlier. The strain of meeting long-continued barbarian pressure in this region contributed not a little to the decline of the Roman Empire; and in the end the western provinces were lost and the civilization of Rome was entrusted for defence to the walls of Constantinople.

The geographical knowledge of the Romans was by no means confined to the provinces of the Empire, but such acquaintance as they gained with the outer world was generally of the kind which comes from trade. Of the great trade routes and the countries which they served the Romans had reasonably correct ideas. Elsewhere, when trade was not in question, their ignorance was profound.

The Roman Empire was so large and the regions it contained were so varied that essential commodities could all be produced within its limits, and external trade for the most part dealt in certain articles of luxury. One of these was amber, a substance found on the shores of the Baltic and brought to the Mediterranean world by a route which ran south across Germany through Bohemia to the Danube,

and thence round the eastern foothills of the Alps to the Adriatic. To the amber trade much of Rome's knowledge of central Europe was due, and it is the amber trade which explains the presence of scattered articles of Italian origin in northern Germany, and even on the



#### INDIA SYMBOLISED

Evidence of the interest taken by the Romans in their Indian trade is furnished by a diadema found at Lampsacus. It symbolises India, and has accurate renderings of Indian fauna.

*Constantinople Museum; from Jahrbuch d. deutsch. arch. Inst.*

coasts of Scandinavia. In the early days of the Empire Roman traders had penetrated north of the Danube with the enlightened encouragement of at least one potentate in Bohemia, but it was not until the principate of Nero that a Roman is known to have made the journey across Germany from Austria to the Baltic.

There was a certain man named Julianus—perhaps that Claudius Julianus who was later admiral of the western Mediterranean fleet—who was commissioned by Nero to organize some gladiatorial shows; and his anxiety to make the show worthy of his master's reputation led him to send a Roman knight to buy amber in the place where it was mined. The expedition was a success, and its hero brought back amber enough to make a nine-days' wonder in Rome; but besides this he gained some information and announced that the distance from Carnuntum, on the Danube just below Vienna, to the Baltic coast was about six hundred miles. Since the journey as the crow flies from Carnuntum

to the amber-bearing coast of Samland—round about Königsberg in East Prussia—is almost exactly five hundred Roman miles, this voyager's report of the distance actually covered by his caravan was probably not far from right."

In Europe, however, commercial exploration was limited to comparatively narrow fields. In Asia the distances were greater and the attractions more compelling. Between the

**Communications** Roman world and China  
**with the East** lay a vast tract of country

through which communications were made difficult both by natural obstacles and by the political barrier of Parthia and its dependencies. Again, between Egypt and Ceylon there lay an ocean waiting for a man bold enough to sail straight across. That a way could be found round it had long been known, but the coastal route to India was so devious, so wasteful of time, and so much exposed to the piratical activities of the tribes who lived along the shore, that the Indian trade waited for its full development until a man arose bold enough to brave the monsoon and set his course straight from Aden to Bombay or Mangalore.

The East produced articles of trade for which wealthy Romans would pay whatever price was asked. From India there came ivory, pearls, precious stones, textiles of various kinds and, above all, pepper, in which the traffic was large. Pepper was a commodity much prized in Rome; and to the pepper stores built by the emperor Domitian, beside the Sacred Way, a constant supply was brought from the coast of Malabar. Whereas in modern times, as Gibbon observes, the improvement of trade and navigation has 'multiplied the quantity and reduced the price' to less than a tenth of what it was in the first century A.D., pepper in Rome was a luxury for the few who could afford to pay something like twenty shillings of English money for a pound. Nevertheless, the demand was far from negligible, and the pepper trade produced both revenue and employment.

Egypt was the avenue through which Indian commerce normally reached the Mediterranean, and the Romans took care

that this should be so. From 30 B.C. to the time of Trajan, when Rome had possession of Egypt but not of Arabia Petraea—the country lying between the east coast of the Red Sea and Palestine—there was some danger that the Indian trade might escape the charges levied on it in Egypt by crossing Arabia to the Mediterranean. Customs dues were regarded by the Roman government as a useful and legitimate means of raising money, and they were exacted not merely on goods entering the Empire, but on such as passed from one part of the Empire to another. The tariffs were not in any sense protective and consequently they were low: five per cent. of the value was a high rate, and two and a half per cent. was more normal. There was, however, one exception, where the tariff was apparently well-nigh prohibitive. This was the eastern coast of the Red Sea, from which the Roman government made a determined effort to drive commerce across to the opposite coast of Egypt. At the mouth of the Wadi Hamdh, a few miles to the south of Wejh, lay the White Township (Leuke Kome), and here we know that a Roman customs station was established to collect dues of twenty-five per cent. on the merchandise of any traders who might try to evade the passage through Egypt.

In Egypt itself the profitable carrying trade was fostered by the government with assiduity. One thing which clearly called for **Carrying trade** government supervision was **through Egypt** the communications between the Nile and the Red Sea. The land roads to the eastern ports radiated from Coptos, thirty miles or so north of Luxor, and thence they led to three different points on the coast, of which the nearest was Leukos Limen (Kosseir). The caravan routes to these places were controlled by the government, and there is still preserved an inscription which records the charges made for their use in the time of Domitian—charges which varied from five drachmae for a seaman or ship's carpenter to a hundred for a woman of shady reputation.

But in addition to the land routes there was water communication from Nile to Red Sea by the ancient counterpart of

the Suez Canal. The long history of this channel begins at least as early as the time of the nineteenth Egyptian dynasty (thirteenth century B.C.); but though it was not finally blocked until after A.D. 700, it was by no means in continuous use. Under the weak kings who misruled Egypt in the latter days of its independence the channel fell into disrepair, and though an attempt to reopen it was made by the Pharaoh Necho about 600 B.C., its proper restoration was left for a Persian conqueror, Darius the Great. This, although it is denied by the geographer Strabo, we know on the authority of Darius himself; for when de Lesseps, in digging the modern canal, had reached the point known as 'kilometre 150,' he unearthed a granite block bearing the announcement in ancient Persian that Darius had opened a way whereby ships now sailed from Egypt to Persia, according to his will.

In Ptolemaic times the sea-to-sea communications suffered further vicissitudes, but the Romans, with their usual care for public works, took the navigable waterways under their charge; and after various smaller repairs the canal was brought into the most effective use it knew in antiquity through the energy of the emperor Trajan. Its importance in Roman times is explained by the development of the eastern trade, and this development was due to a discovery so momentous as to demand mention. For long centuries the Indian Ocean, with its unaccountable gales, had been a sea on which men would not venture out of sight of land. Thus the voyage from Aden to India was a laborious progress round the coasts of southern Arabia and Baluchistan, and the journey from Egypt to southern India and back was an undertaking of two years or three.

But at some time between 200 B.C. and A.D. 50 a certain Hippalus—who was one of the captains engaged in the eastern trade—was emboldened by his experience of the periodic winds to entrust himself to the mercy of the monsoons and set his course straight from Aden towards Malabar. The success of Hippalus opened a new era in the history of eastern com-

merce; the voyage from Egypt to India and back could now be made within twelve months, and trade increased as expenses were reduced. Knowledge grew as well and, by the time of Hadrian, Ptolemy the geographer could give some account of eastern India and even of the lands beyond (see Chap. 73).

The second great region in the East which attracted the interest of Rome was the country between Asia Minor and the mountains of Turkistan. From the time of Julius Caesar, if not before, silk was a commodity in great demand at Rome, and the Chinese made it their business to keep the secret of the silkworm to themselves. It was not until the middle of the sixth century A.D. that silk was produced in Europe. The story of its arrival is familiar. The emperor Justinian, who found the trade routes to China continuously blocked by the hostile Persian power, took into his service two Persian missionaries whose long residence in China had given them a peculiar knowledge of the silkworm and its ways. From their second expedition to the East these two returned with a bamboo tube containing eggs which were hatched in Constantinople and produced a race of worms on whose progeny Europe depended for its silk for centuries.

But in earlier times, though silk was spun and worked in the Aegean, the raw material had to be brought from China. To some extent the Indian route was used, but the difficulties of communication between China and India appear to have been so great that the direct line eastwards from the Caspian through Turkistan offered greater attractions. Here, however, were the Parthians, who undoubtedly made a determined effort to command the Chinese trade.

On the Chinese route there was a key position in the strip of country which lay between the southern end of the Caspian and the Elburz mountains—a strip called in ancient times Hyrcania, and now known as the Persian province of Mazanderan—and this position had been seized by the Parthians in the early days of their empire during the second century B.C. Two of the Parthian conquerors, Phraates I




and his more famous brother Mithradates (who is not to be confused with Mithradates, king of Pontus), had extended their power over Hyrcania and the territory east of it towards Merv with such success that the best of the routes to China lay completely under Parthian control. It is true that to the north a way might be opened round the Parthian flank: by crossing the Caspian it was possible to travel up the river Oxus to the Hindu Kush. But between the Roman world and the Caspian there lay Armenia and the Caucasus—countries to which Rome extended her regime only after much trouble.

In these regions Rome's interest was due to more causes than one. For military reasons they could not be allowed to

become a hostile base whence attacks might be launched on Asia Minor; but the active policy which Rome pursued throughout the early Empire, both in Armenia and in the Caucasian districts to the north, seems to have been due in part to commercial considerations. China, indeed, was far away, and whatever tales may be told by patriotic poets like Horace and Propertius, it is unlikely that Chinese embassies reached Rome in the time of Augustus. Nevertheless, interest in China was strong, as might be divined from the amount of silk which the Roman world consumed, and we have records of more journeys than one by the overland route.

There is preserved the road book of a certain Isidore who journeyed from Syria



TYPE OF THE GREAT CITIES THAT FLOURISHED IN THE SECURITY OF AFRICA—


Of all Rome's frontier provinces Africa presented the fewest problems. There were no restless hordes of barbarians behind the uncertain protection of a river or the artificial barrier of a 'limes'; only the nomad Berbers of the Saharan steppe, never really subdued but only demanding the presence of a single legion, the Third Augusta. Hence the land prospered, as its ruins testify; this is a southward view across the western quarter of Thamugadi in Algeria, the modern Timgad, showing its very considerable extent.

*Photo, Cr&I*

through Parthia, and thence by Hyrcania to Afghanistan, where he met traders from China at Kandahar. We know again from Chinese sources that the Chinese were as anxious to break down the Parthian obstacle as were the Romans, and even sent a mission in A.D. 97 which penetrated to the Persian Gulf. But there it was stopped by Parthian guile. Wherever its objective, 'Ta Ts'in,' may have been—whether this means the Roman world itself or merely the entrepôts of southern Arabia—Kan Ying, the leader of the expedition, was persuaded to go home from the shores of the Persian Gulf by tales that the voyage to Ta Ts'in might take two years if the winds were unkind.

In the end it was not by land, but by sea, that direct intercourse was established

between China and the western world. Somewhere about the end of the first century A.D. an Egyptian merchant sailed round to Tong King, and in 166 there arrived at the Chinese court—probably at the southern capital, Nanking—some merchants who were so far familiar with the Mediterranean world that the Chinese could regard them as ambassadors from the emperor Marcus Aurelius. From that time onwards western knowledge of the Far East slowly accumulated, until the fourth century historian, Ammianus Marcellinus, was able to record that the Chinese live in a country encircled by a wall. With that piece of detailed information we may leave the remoter regions and return to the Roman Empire itself.



—THE VAST RUINS OF TIMGAD BUILT FOR THE VETERANS OF A ROMAN LEGION

Thamugadi was built under Trajan by Munatius Gallus as a place of settlement for retired veterans. In the opposite page is the arch erected in honour, probably, of Trajan on the site of what was originally the western gate through which ran the road to the legionary camp at Lambaesis; above is the temple to the Genius of the Colony, with the two columns of the Capitulum in the distance and, just beyond the crossroad, the colonnades of the market-place presented to the city by a knight called Sertius and his wife.

*Photo, Cr&I*

Between A.D. 121 and 132 the emperor Hadrian paid personal visits of inspection to every one of the provinces over which he ruled. His journeyings were complicated, and to follow them in detail would be a task too much over-weighted with petty facts to have a place in this survey of the Empire; but the age of Hadrian is one in which the Empire may be studied at its best. The administrative machine, which it had been the work of the first century to design, was giving the world a government in which mildness and efficiency were combined. The insistent pressure of the barbarian was not yet felt, and consequently the military establishments had not begun to strain the taxable capacity of the Roman world. Within the Empire and without, with the most insignificant exceptions, there reigned a prosperity and a peace as complete as any known to history.

Already, it is true, the Roman mind and character were changing and the Roman stock was not what it had been once. The country parts of Italy, indeed, were still unaffected, but in the cities,

and particularly in Rome itself, not only character but population had changed. The spread of wealth and soft living are subjects too trite to need discussion; but it is also to be remembered that Rome was constantly receiving new inhabitants who were not Italians by race.

In the economic system of the ancient world the place assigned to slaves was extremely large; and the slaves, of whom a single household might boast five hundred, were drawn from foreign parts. Some came from Europe, but more from the East, and all alike might hope—though the hope was not always fulfilled—to receive their freedom from the habitual generosity of their Roman masters. Even though efforts had been made by Augustus to set legal obstacles in the way of manumission, the number of slaves thus liberated was very large; nor was it generally long before either they themselves or their descendants received full citizen rights, and even entered the public services of Rome.

But such people, though their legal status might be new, retained their



GRACEFUL FIGURES SYMBOLISING THE NATIONS THAT OWNED ROME'S SWAY

A temple in Rome dedicated by Antoninus Pius to his predecessor Hadrian—some of its pillars can still be seen in the modern Exchange—had the face of the platform adorned with figures of provinces or nations subject to Rome, one in relief under each column. Eighteen of the original thirty-eight are preserved; of the two shown here that on the left is sometimes called Germania, sometimes Gallia, while the other is possibly Hispania or Britannia.

*Palazzo dei Conservatori; photo, Mascioni*

characters unaltered. Spaniards or Moors; Germans or Greeks, they remained what nature had made them; and though they might adopt the outward form of Roman culture, they were none the more Italian for that. Their outlook and their morals were not greatly changed, and in many cases they kept the peculiar religion which they had known from youth. By the time of Hadrian the streets of Rome would have shocked a Cato and surprised even the tolerant eye of Cicero. But though Roman mind and Roman manners may by now have been in decline, the provincial populations, under a government which had lost nothing of its vigour, were rising to new heights of prosperous achievement.

Of the diversity of provinces which the Empire contained we may be reminded by the Stock Exchange of modern Rome, which still displays columns belonging to the ancient building on whose site it stands—a temple dedicated to the dead Hadrian by his successor, Antoninus Pius.

The podium of this temple **Diversity of subject peoples** was originally decorated with a series of reliefs, each bearing a figure to represent one of the provinces which Hadrian had ruled; and of these figures there were probably thirty-eight. Each of the provinces had peculiarities of its own, and the peculiarities are not without interest: but so often they were due to geographical factors, and were of merely local significance, that a description of them in order would inevitably tend to produce an impression blurred by excessive detail of only secondary importance. If the picture is to be clear it must present a more general view of the Roman world, and even then attention must be concentrated on the more striking features.

Before the provinces comes Italy itself. Though by the time of Hadrian the frontiers of Italy had long ceased to mark any sharp division between the rulers and the ruled, though again—as has been said already—the Italian population was being changed, and perhaps invigorated, by the absorption of new blood from outside, Italy still remained the centre of government and a privileged region whose

welfare not only depended on, but also affected, the prosperity of the Empire as a whole. The city of Rome itself and many of the features it possessed in common with every city of the Roman world are described elsewhere (see Chap. 71); but the countryside of Italy deserves some notice too, both for its own sake and because, like Rome, it was in some ways typical of the Roman world at large.

Of the differences between Roman times and our own one of the most far-reaching is that which has befallen the economic significance of land. In Italy it was the one gilt-edged investment. Among men of wealth the landowners pre-dominated. And when money flowed into a country with more than usual rapidity, as it did into Italy during the second century B.C., the rush to invest it in land was so severe that a social problem was produced by the mass of small land-holders who accepted the inducement offered to make them give up their holdings, and who thereafter too often remained unemployed. Throughout the history of the Roman world land played a leading part in its economy; and to whatever different uses land might be put in different parts of the Empire, it was from the land that the richer classes tended to derive their income.

When the wealthy chose land for the investment of their money and became landlords on a large scale, their property might either be worked by their own employes or be let out to tenant-farmers; and it was inevitable that in course of time the tenant system should come to predominate. The landlords had generally bought their land not from any desire for a farmer's life, but merely because the revenue from farms was a dependable kind of interest on invested capital. The life of the country squire had no attractions strong enough to draw men away from the cities, where all the amenities of life in the ancient world were to be found. Landlords, for the greater part of the year, were absentees. In their absence the estates might indeed be managed for them by bailiffs; but even bailiffs needed some supervision, and it was found simpler to let the land to tenants with

**Land the main investment**



### THE ATTRACTIONS OF VITICULTURE

Vine-growing under the Empire spread rapidly in the richer parts of Italy, such as Campania, and in the provinces; to the detriment, even, of agriculture. This relief at Ince-Blundell Hall, from a sarcophagus, shows a wine-store in a vineyard, with slaves drawing wine from the huge half-buried 'dolia.'

*From Rossetzoff 'Social History of Roman Empire,' Clarendon Press*

whom the landlords had no need to deal except when rents fell due.

The uses to which the land was put were as varied as they are to-day. In Italy, where the surface of the country is by no means uniformly rich, large parts of the poorer regions had been laid down to grass and converted into ranches by the middle of the second century B.C. And on the steeper slopes, where failure to hold up the soil by terraces had allowed the hill-sides to be partially denuded, such fertile ground as remained had been freely planted with olives and vines. But these were not confined to the hills: vines especially spread over the plains—even over the richest such as Campania, though Campania was fertile enough to allow other crops to be sown even in the vineyards themselves. In course of time viticulture took so firm a hold not only on Italy, but on the provinces as well, that soon after A.D. 90 the emperor Domitian issued an edict ordering that in Italy no more land should be put under vines and that in the provinces half of the existing plantations should be destroyed. Whatever the object of this may have been, whether merely to promote the growth of corn, or also to protect the interest of wine producers in Italy, the fact that this edict was issued, even though its provisions were never carried into complete effect, is a plain indication of the extent to which wine production bulked

in the economy of the Roman world.

The country parts of Italy were self-supporting; they grew corn enough to feed a population which, measured by modern standards, was sparse. But Rome itself had to be fed from abroad; and the corn on which it lived was brought up the Tiber, at first from Sicily and Sardinia, and later more particularly from Tunisia and Egypt. Besides these, however, there were many other regions, still famous for their corn, where in ancient times agriculture was already the main source of wealth.

One such was the lower Danube valley, which first supplied wheat for the city of Rome during the principate of Nero. A second was the European coast of the Black Sea, where the kingdom of Bosphorus—round about the Crimea—though it was not technically a province, lay under the strongest Roman influence, and provided at least some part of the food required by the Roman military establishments in the East. To enumerate the corn lands of the Empire would be tedious, but one other productive region is interesting enough to deserve a mention. Northern France and Britain were famous at various times for their agricultural activity; and the 'Roman villas,' the remains of which are the most familiar reminder in southern England of the Romano-British age, were in most cases properties belonging to members of the British aristocracy engaged in the management of large estates.

In Britain, however, corn land was not the only national asset. It would probably be an exaggeration to suggest that the emperor Claudius was moved to invade Britain in A.D. 43 by a desire to secure its mineral wealth; but there is no doubt that very soon after the Roman occupation the minerals of this country began to be exploited. Coal, indeed—the richest of Britain's mineral resources—was used in Roman times only to an insignificant

extent. Coal mines were unknown, and such coal as was consumed seems to have come wholly from surface outcrops. Again, neither gold nor iron was a compelling attraction. Iron, though it was plentiful, the Romans could find nearer home; and Ireland, which in the Bronze Age had been among the chief sources of the European gold supply, they left alone.

During the first two centuries of the Roman occupation, lead was the ore on which mining activities were mainly concentrated. In the Mendip Hills of Somerset, in Flintshire and Derbyshire, as well as in several other counties, lead was freely worked in Roman times.

**The Mines of Britain and Spain** Tin production, on the other hand, which had reached large dimensions before the Romans came, seems almost to have ceased with the Roman occupation. It has been plausibly suggested that tin mining in Britain was killed during the first two centuries of our era by the competition of Spain, which in mineral resources was the richest of all the regions included in the Roman Empire. In the north-west of the Spanish peninsula, in southern Portugal and again in the Sierra Morena, where the mines of Rio Tinto still retain their fame, mineral wealth was abundant; and it seems to have been this wealth which not only attracted Italians to Spain in large numbers but also made Spain one of the greatest assets to the imperial exchequer.

Mines, like all other sources of production, paid toll to the state; but the ways in which the state levied its demands were varied. In many cases mines were state property, so that the state had merely to provide for their working and then could take profits. Of such mines some were worked by convicts; for penal servitude—an institution probably adopted from Egypt—was a recognized punishment in the Roman world. Others were leased to companies, large or

small, which rented their mining rights from the state; and others again were run by contractors paid according to results.

From a place now called Aljustrel in Portugal, where silver was mined for the state, we have some light shed on the conditions which prevailed in a mining village under government control. Elaborate regulations were made about what we should call services of public utility, and even the local shopkeepers could only trade with official permission and on such terms as the government laid down. But mines were often in private hands. Prospectors were not discouraged; and in Britain, where there is conclusive evidence for state-owned mines, there are also hints that in some regions, such as Derbyshire, private individuals were exploiting the deposits of lead.

The interest and difficulty alike of the study of Roman history are due in large measure to the lack of similarity between one part of the Empire and another. Differences, often of great moment, existed between various provinces, and even in a single region far-reaching changes were



**TILLAGE AND PASTURE IN ROME'S GRANARY**

Life on the great estates that supplied Rome with corn is illustrated by a second-century mosaic from the floor of a villa in Tunisia—Africa was one of the chief granaries of the Empire. Round the margin are hunting scenes, but in the centre, here shown, are herds before a byre and a man ploughing.

*Tripoli Museum; from Monuments Piet*

sometimes produced in the course of a hundred years. The manifold uses to which the land was put constitute a large subject: corn, olives, wine, wool and flax are only the chief commodities to one or more of which the agricultural resources of a province might be devoted. Much, again, might be said about the industries

Barriers indeed existed. Languages were as various as they are now; but in an age when men were not so deeply committed to a single tongue as they are when they have to write it and to read it day by day, bilingualism was not the formidable achievement it has since become.

Religion, again, did little to draw peoples asunder; the innumerable cults of a polytheistic world were not antagonistic to one another, and it was only with the advent of Jewish and Christian monotheism that religious intolerance and the missionary spirit made their appearance in the ancient world. Influences like these which tended to keep the peoples of the Roman Empire apart were negligible in the presence of those which made for free and untrammelled intercourse.



SHIP OF THE GRAIN FLEET THAT FED ROME

The painted decoration of a funeral monument at Ostia shows us a merchant ship engaged in the service of the 'annona' or corn supply for Rome. Its name is given, *Isis Geminiana*; also that of the captain on the poop, *Farnaces*, and of the owner, probably the inmate of the tomb, *Abascantus*.

*Vatican Museum, Rome; photo, Alinari*

which produced the finished articles needed for daily life—about the organization of production and about the way in which Italian workers, in some lines at least, gradually succumbed to the competition of the provinces. And beyond this there is the carrying trade, and the banking arrangements whereby commercial transactions were made possible without immediate payment in cash. All these, however, are subjects for Chapter 76: here we must consider some of those characteristic features which help to give the Roman Empire its significance in the history of the world.

The peoples of the Roman Empire, with few exceptions—of which the Egyptians and the inhabitants of North Africa were the most notable—belonged to stocks not wholly unrelated to that from which the Romans themselves were sprung. Few provinces had populations divided from the Italians by a wider gulf than that which separates us from many other peoples of modern Europe. In material culture and in race the various parts of the Roman Empire could boast an underlying similarity which between many of the peoples owning allegiance to the British Crown is noticeably absent.

Rome owed a heavy debt to the culture of Greece, which in some measure bound together all the regions in which it had taken root. Almost the whole circuit of the Mediterranean coast had fallen at one time or another under the influence of Hellas, and in certain regions, such as the Balkan peninsula, Asia Minor and Syria, this influence had been carried far inland. It was only in the remoter parts of Spain, in Gaul north of the Cevennes, in Britain, Germany and to some extent in the provinces along the Danube, that Rome found peoples comparatively immune from Hellenic influence. In the remaining parts of the Empire the native populations had been touched in some degree or other by the same stream of culture as Rome herself.

The peoples were at least not wholly unacquainted with the type of institutions familiar to Rome. They shared the same ideals of free government, and they were acquainted with the chief instrument by which in the ancient world these ideas were realized. This was the city state, a form of political organization which embraced in its citizenship all the free inhabitants of a certain limited area and

which managed its affairs with the aid of magistrates and a council. The self-governing city state had been the essential foundation of Greek civilization in the age of independence; but the complete autonomy that it then enjoyed had contributed largely to the decay of Greece.

Independence had bred jealousy; and it was left for Rome to devise a means of permanently reconciling the independence of the cities with loyalty to a larger whole. In the Roman world the city state was the characteristic, though by no means the only, form of political organization, and its survival within an empire was made possible by the most profound and effective feature in the political practice of Rome.

The cities of the Roman Empire handed over the control of their foreign relations to Rome; they were no longer free to declare war on their neighbours as they willed, and thus they were prevented from wasting their strength in those petty squabbles which had sapped the vitality of fourth-century Greece. But of their own domestic government they retained control; and so the city state remained essentially unimpaired—an institution through which men might govern themselves and dispose as they would of their own affairs.

The occupation of a country by Rome brought changes which varied according to the degree of culture which its inhabitants already possessed. In the treatment of their subjects the Romans pursued the course of broad-minded tolerance which the Persians had tried before them, and resolutely turned their back on the coercive ways followed by the Semitic empire of Assyria. In general it may be said that Rome respected civilizations other than her own, and rarely—if ever—attempted to force the process of Romanisation. Roman manners, Roman customs and the material

elements of Roman life naturally permeated the provinces in some degree or other; and regions like the remoter districts of Spain, which were still almost wholly immune from Roman influence in the sixth century A.D., were exceptional. The extensive settlement of Italians in the provinces, and the free intercourse made possible by the construction of those roads for which the name of Rome is famous, combined to make Roman culture familiar to the provincial populations. But further than this Rome did not go; and such features of the Roman ways of life as were adopted by the native peoples were adopted not under duress but on their merits.

Nor, again, was there any wholesale Romanisation in material culture. It is true, of course, that the 'villas' of the Romano-British aristocracy were regularly warmed with hot air in the Roman style, and it is true that the more elaborate decorations of these establishments found their inspiration in Italy. But these developments were adapted to houses whose plan is unlike anything in southern Europe. Their lay-out is northern and non-Roman in origin.



#### EXPLOITING THE MINERALS OF SPAIN

The mineral wealth of Spain made it one of the most important provinces. Near Linares in the Sierra Morena was the town of Castulo (Cazlona) with its lead mines, and a relief found there shows a party of miners in charge of a foreman descending a working; one carries a pick, the foreman a lantern.

*From Daubré, in Revue archéologique, E. Leroux*



There are three matters on which the provincial policy of Rome demands special notice—religion, language and law. In law and language the debt of modern Europe to Rome is notorious, and the Roman attitude to religion is of interest, because it was Rome that had to face the problems presented by Christianity.

To strange religions, merely because they were strange, the Romans were not opposed. In the provinces native deities freely survived, sometimes identified with one of the Roman gods and sometimes not. Again,

for their private religion the Romans often adopted alien cults, of which the Mithraism of Persia is the most famous. Even Judaism, in spite of its aggressive exclusiveness, was for long protected by the Roman government. Special privileges were granted to Jews throughout the Roman world; Jews held posts of high importance in the imperial administration, and some members at least of the house of the Herods came to be on terms of closest intimacy with the court at Rome.

Religion was only attacked if it became objectionable on secular grounds. The emperors Tiberius, Claudius and Nero repressed Druidism in Gaul and Britain because the Druids made themselves apostles of a nationalism directed against Rome. Jerusalem was destroyed because imprudent ambition had raised the cry of Jewish independence. And finally the Christians were persecuted because repeated anti-Christian riots convinced the government, rightly or wrongly, that the presence of Christians was an incitement to breaches of the peace. But for the rest, provided that they would pay to the gods of the imperial power such respect as any polytheist might show without a qualm, the provincials were left to worship their own gods in their own way, until Christianity conquered rulers and ruled alike in the fourth century.

In language the changes produced by Roman occupation are more difficult to assess and have often been exaggerated. It is a familiar fact that in France and the Spanish peninsula, as well as in Italy itself, the speech of modern times has grown out of the Latin which the

Romans introduced. Elsewhere, however, even though a linguistic debt is owed to Rome, the debt has been less directly incurred. In Britain, where the alphabet used is Latin, the Latin elements in English, which are plentiful enough, were derived, not from the Latin spoken in Britain during the Roman age, but principally from the Latin of the medieval church and from French.

The survival of Welsh, which is derived from the tongue spoken by the Celtic population of Britain before the Romans came, is by itself evidence enough that official Latin did not destroy the native speech; and though it is often suggested that the British population in Roman times was bilingual, there is very little reason for thinking that the masses had anything more than the most superficial acquaintance with Latin. Latin, indeed, is the language of such casual scrawlings as have survived on pots or walls; but monuments of this kind are so few that they are valueless as evidence to show that Latin was known by the whole population.

France, Asia Minor and North Africa were all affected more deeply than Britain by Rome; yet we find their inhabitants by no means wholly bilingual. It is well known that Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons at the end of the second century A.D., had often to preach in Celtic to make himself intelligible; and in the fourth century S. Jerome claimed that there could still be recognised a similarity between the Celtic spoken by the Treviri in the valley of the Moselle and that of the Galatians in Asia Minor. And from Asia Minor comes a more famous piece of evidence. When S. Paul cured the cripple at Lystra and moved the natives to say 'the gods are come down to us in the likeness of men,' the language used was 'the speech of Lycaonia'; and inscriptions discovered during the last fifty years lend support to the suggestion of this passage that in Asia Minor pre-Roman dialects freely survived. Indeed, they did not die out until the sixth century.

Again, there is testimony from Africa. Of the native Berber traces are few, though their scarcity does not prove that

**Tolerance usual  
in religion**

**Survivals of  
native speech**

Berber was rarely spoken. But the Semitic dialect which the Carthaginians introduced was widely preserved, and so late as the fifth century we find S. Augustine, bishop of Hippo, choosing a man who could speak Punic to be bishop of a place not fifty miles from Hippo itself, where nevertheless Latin does not seem to have been universally known. On the question of language our conclusion must be that Latin did not kill the native tongues. Though in the larger towns, where settlers from Italy were to be found, Latin doubtless prevailed, and though the natives up and down the country may have had a smattering of Latin like that which the indigenous peoples of North Africa now have of French, the old local speech seems still to have remained the speech of the people.

There remains the Roman law—the most enduring of all the legacies left by Rome to her successors (see Chap. 78). In spite of its fame, it cannot be claimed that the legal system elaborated by the Romans made any essential contribution to the well-being of the Empire during the first two centuries of our era. For a people to be prosperous it is essential that justice shall be open to all its members; but that this was the case in the Roman Empire was due more to the governmental ideals and administrative capacity of the Romans than to their possession of a remarkable juristic method and a particular body of law. Before the year 212 A.D., when the emperor Caracalla conferred

**Spread of Roman Law** the rights of Roman citizenship on virtually the whole free population of the Empire, the Roman citizens, who alone lived under the full dominion of the Roman Law, were only a section of the people for whose welfare the Emperor was responsible.


The 'peregrini'—provincials who had not received the Roman franchise—lived at first under their own laws and institutions, though these were worked under a certain amount of Roman control. Criminal justice, at least in cases of serious importance, was administered by the governor of a province, and in civil matters, too, the governors tended to encroach on the autonomy of local jurisdiction. But when Romans and non-

Roman law came thus into contact, the native systems were by no means suppressed. Roman law and local law interacted: each was affected by the other: and it is the readiness of Rome to respect the customs of the provinces, even at the cost of modifying her own juridical system, that makes the attitude of Rome in the sphere of law typical of her whole imperial policy. Even after the 'constitutio Antoniniana' had turned most of the provincials into Roman citizens wholly amenable to Roman law, no complete uniformity was achieved. Local variations persisted, and the government yielded to the strength of provincial usage.

The achievement of Rome was to combine, through the length and breadth of her dominions, efficient administration with the **Roman and native law combined** fullest possible measure of local independence.

The decline of the Roman Empire is a story that is told in Chronicles XII and XIII. Barbarian attacks on the frontiers and a consequent increase in the tax-gatherers' demands forced the emperors' hands to measures which in the end were disastrous. But from the tale there emerge two lessons which are clear. The first is this—that, if human life is to be at its best, men must be allowed at least a certain freedom to manage their own affairs and to work out their own salvation. And the second is not very different: that state interference with local business and private affairs, though it be begun with the best and most beneficent intentions, runs a danger of leading to a bureaucratic control which deprives its subjects of their essential independence and turns free human beings into machines.

Such was the experience of the Roman Empire. It was an experience brought upon the Roman world by circumstances beyond Roman control. And even towards the end, when troubles multiplied, the tolerance and liberality of Rome were not forgotten. It was in the closing years of the fourth century A.D. that the poet Claudian wrote what still remains one of the most adequate epitaphs on Imperial Rome—'She was not the Mistress but the Mother of her People.'



BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF THE ARCHITECTURAL SPLENDOURS IN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ROME

1. Capitoline Hill. 2. Basilica Ulpia. 3. Forum of Trajan. 4. Forum of Augustus. 5. Forum of Nerva or Transitorium and Temple of Peace. 6. Forum of Vespasian and Temple of Peace. 7. Temple of Venus. 8. Basilica Aemilia. 9. Temple of Faustina and Antoninus. 10. Portico of Livia. 11. Baths of Titus and Trajan. 12. Colosseum. 13. Colossal statue of Nero. 14. Temple of Venus and Roma. 15. Basilica of Constantine. 16. House of the Vestals. 17. Temple of Vesta. 18. Triumphal Arch of Augustus. 19. Temple of Castor and Pollux. 20. Basilica Julia. 21. Rostra. 22. Arch of Septimius Severus. 23-25. Imperial Palaces on the Palatine Hill. 26. Circus Maximus. 27. The Velabrum quarter. 28. Theatre of Marcellus.

From the reconstruction in plaster by Professor Marsellini

# A DAY IN THE LIFE OF IMPERIAL ROME

The luxurious Capital of the Caesars and  
the daily Doings of its motley Population

By F. H. MARSHALL

Korae Professor of Byzantine History, King's College, London University; Author of  
Discovery in Greek Lands, etc.

THE Latin poets of a late age bear remarkable testimony to the enthusiasm with which the imperial city of Rome inspired those who belonged to her not by birth but by adoption. About the year A.D. 400 two poets of very different origin, one from an Eastern, the other from a Western province, were both at one in singing the praises of Imperial Rome in fervent strains. Claudian, of Asiatic birth, describes in his poem on Stilicho's Consulship the benefits conferred by Rome upon her far-flung provinces. Lines like these strike the key-note :

She to her bosom took the human race,  
Like a fond mother, not a mistress cold.  
The conquered, citizens became by grace—  
A charm her sons in willing chains to hold.

A few years later, after the sack of Rome by the Goths under Alaric, Rutilius, who had estates in southern France, uttered praises no less emphatic :

Of peoples diverse thou hast made one race ;  
In bliss the unjust fall beneath thy feet.  
In partnership thy laws these foes embrace,  
And thus the City and the World do meet.


And so it becomes no unworthy task to try to picture what manner of life men lived in this world city of Imperial Rome.

Attempts have been made to estimate the population of the city of the Caesars. Its area, as enclosed between the left bank of the Tiber and the Aurelian wall, was some 3,075 acres, and the population was undoubtedly dense. In its more crowded parts, thanks to the huge blocks of 'island' tenements, the dwellers seem to have been more thickly massed than in the most populous parts of London. All conjectures, whether based on the number of inhabitants to the acre or of those in

receipt of the dole, must remain very uncertain. Yet there is, within fairly wide limits, some measure of agreement amongst those who have made a special study of this subject, and it may be said that the round figure of a million and a half, inclusive of slaves, is a by no means fantastic estimate of the population of Imperial Rome in the first century after Christ.

In depicting the different classes of people who inhabited this great city, the most convenient method is to point out what were the chief changes which had ensued in each since the days of Cicero (see Chap. 63). One main tendency should be stressed. Sharp division of social classes Thanks to the social legislation of the emperor Augustus, the different grades of society had become more sharply divided. Thus the senatorial order, though it contained many of the old Republican families, was largely of the emperor's creating, and the rank bestowed was hereditary.

The senator, who was still distinguished by the tunic with the broad purple stripe, had to possess property of a certain minimum value ; this minimum estimated in terms of to-day would be about £10,000. He was debarred from marriage with a freedwoman. He might occupy useful administrative posts in the senatorial provinces, and in the Senate performed legislative and judicial work, but could no longer, as under the Republic, affect to control the Roman world. If he was appointed consul he soon discovered that it was a post of dignity and nothing more, and in a few months had to make way for a successor. The senator's position seems to have corresponded to that of an average peer ; he had the title of 'Most Illustrious,' enjoyed the distinctive



### PLAN OF IMPERIAL ROME AS IT WAS DEVELOPED AFTER 29 B.C.

Comparison of this plan with that of Republican Rome in page 180 shows the great enlargement of the city effected after 29 B.C. Its westward extension took in the Campus Martius, where there arose the Stadium and Odeum of Domitian, Agrippa's Baths and other imposing structures; its extension southward to the Appian Gate included the vast Baths of Caracalla. And in the heart of the city arose an astonishing wealth of marble buildings. The walls were begun by Aurelian (c. 270).

dress, and was entitled to a front seat at entertainments.

In many respects the next order, the Equestrian, is the more interesting under the Empire. With the sweeping away of the tax-farming system, it lost much of its financial importance. The emperors strictly controlled admission, and, while insisting on the old property qualification of the equivalent of £4,000, aimed at creating a useful class of public servants. The shrewd emperor Augustus wanted them for work in the more exposed provinces, and especially in Egypt, where a watchful control was necessary, and for administrative posts in Italy.

The mass of the population, the 'plebs urbana,' which under the later Republic had become so menacing a problem, still caused much anxiety. The graver disorders had been cured, thanks to the suppression of political clubs and better policing. Openings for municipal activity were created by the establishment of the

city wards by Augustus, and the possession of a vote was no longer a lucrative asset in a popular assembly which existed as a mere formality. The tradesmen and artisans continued to pursue their humble callings as under the Republic. Yet the ruin of agricultural life remained essentially unremedied, and there is abundant evidence, besides that of the dole bestowed on 200,000 persons by Augustus, that Rome contained a large idle population. It is not surprising that Annona was deified as the goddess of the corn market in the first century of the Empire, and that free distributions of corn became more frequent and more liberal as time went on. Tickets entitling the bearer to the dole have been preserved, and even children participated in the distributions. Persius satirically defines liberty as the right to draw a portion of musty corn with a miserable ticket.

But the most lurid pictures of the condition of the mass of the population at

Rome are drawn by Juvenal, and though we have to allow for much over-colouring, there is little doubt that the outlines are correct. An Umbricius can with some show of truth exclaim that 'there is no room in the City for honourable arts, no reward for toil.' Rome had become a cosmopolitan city where the quick-witted Greek or Syrian easily ousted the duller Roman. It is not surprising that one of the foremost tasks of the emperors was to keep these crowds of unemployed fed and amused, and Juvenal not unfairly sums up the character of a considerable section of the city populace in the lines :

The folk who erst  
The general's power, the lictor's rods  
bestowed,  
Legions and all, now sits at home and frets,  
For two things only longing, bread and  
games.

As will be seen later, amusements bulked large in the life of Imperial Rome, and vast sums were lavished upon them.

What was essentially a new class arose under the Empire—that of the freedmen. There had, of course, been numerous freedmen under the Republic, but it

was Augustus who definitely fixed their status. He provided for them a special order called *Augustales*, who took over municipal burdens and to them devoted their wealth. That they were proud of the position thus attained is shown by the fact that they had the dignity recorded on their tombstones. The frequent manumission of slaves by testament had reached alarming proportions, and this was checked by legislation. It can be well understood that, as a class largely composed of men of alien blood, the freedmen were perceived to have undesirable features, and their unpopularity would not be lessened by their success in trade, for which they had ample opportunities owing to their exclusion from magistracies.

Inscriptions testify that trade was to a large extent in their hands, and it is not surprising that the freedman under the Empire became the type of vulgar upstart satirised by Petronius in his portrait of Trimalchio. In Horace's day people had looked down upon the freedman's son, but under the Empire power, if not popularity, followed wealth, and freedmen acquired important social influence.



#### A MASTER CUTLER WHO WAS PROUD OF HIS TRADE

Like the baker and contractor Eurysaces, whose tomb is shown in pages 1822 and 1823, Lucius Cornelius Atimetus, a Roman cutler, had his gravestone adorned with reliefs illustrating his trade. Here (left) is his workshop, with two assistants fashioning an article on the anvil, furnace and bellows within handy reach. The other relief shows Atimetus's shop, with knives and sickles hanging in an open press and the cutler in his tunic showing a knife to a dignified customer in a toga.

*British Museum (casts) from the Vatican*

Emperors employed them as household officials, and thus under Claudius a Pallas and a Narcissus became proverbial on account of their wealth and intrigues. Narcissus could return a bold answer to the imperial lady Agrippina, 'accusing her of a woman's imperiousness and ambitions.'

The rôle of slaves was not greatly different from that which had been theirs in Ciceronian times. They continued to minister to the extravagant luxury of the wealthy, and the question 'how many slaves does he keep?' was put by those anxious to ascertain a man's income. Fortunately they lost the opportunity of acting the part of armed ruffians in the train of a Milo or a Clodius. This side of their

nature found scope rather in a studied insolence, as when they disturbed the peace of the public baths in their capacity as attendants upon some vulgar millionaire.



#### DOLE TICKET

Corn was distributed free to applicants in exchange for tickets. This specimen records the second largess of Antoninus Pius.

*British Museum*

Probably the motley appearance of crowds of slaves was even more marked under the Empire than under the Republic. Moorish slaves became popular, and there was also a craze for monstrosities, such as dwarfs and hunchbacks. If Juvenal complains that more will be spent on the purchase of a slave cook or carver than on fees for a son's education by a Quintilian, Quintilian himself says that 'some people set a higher value upon bodies that are distorted, or are in some way or another monstrosities, than on those which have lost nothing of



#### BREAD AND CIRCUSES FOR THE UNEMPLOYED OF ROME

So great was the menace of the enormous unemployed population of Rome that it became an increasingly important and expensive part of the imperial policy to placate them by free distribution of corn and by the provision of spectacles in the arena to which they were admitted without charge: the 'Panem et Circenses' (bread and games) at which Juvenal gibes. A relief from Ephesus shows, above, the wagons bringing in the corn and, below, a gladiatorial combat.

*British Museum*

the blessings of ordinary shape.' Terra-cotta statuettes of the Roman period often represent these deformed slaves. On the other hand, tall and handsome slaves commanded high prices, and it is not without reason that Juvenal complains of the insolent manners of pampered menials. The sources of supply were not so abundant as under the Republic, and prices tended to rise.

The character of women under the early Empire has become almost a by-word, thanks to Juvenal's scathing indictments. It is difficult to preserve an impartial attitude in the face of his diatribes, but a sober estimate will confine his condemnation to a fast set; though it must be admitted that this set was large in the first century after Christ. The counterpart of many of the women with whom he deals in the sixth satire—women who chatter in Greek, bore society with comparisons of Vergil and Horace, and whose talk is like sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal—is to be met with in all civilized societies.

The study of Roman Deterioration in the manners in Cicero's character of women age (see Chap. 63) has prepared us for the extravagances of emancipated women, but it cannot be denied that the symptoms increased in intensity under the Empire. The fortunes accumulated by women became larger, and childless widows were the special mark of the legacy hunter. Tacitus says of a lady of the period that 'she was influential on account both of her money and her childlessness, circumstances which give power in good and bad times alike.' According to Juvenal, even high officials were not ashamed to take a hand in the degrading business:

The praetor bids his lictor haste to make—  
Long have the childless widows been awake—  
For fear his colleague may first innings get,  
And Modia and Albina thus beset.

The marriage tie became more and more disregarded. Juvenal speaks of women who have eight husbands in five years. Seneca says: 'Does any woman blush nowadays at a divorce, seeing that certain women of distinguished and noble birth reckon their years not by the number of the consuls, but by the number of their



NEGRO SLAVE BOY


Representatives of every known race were included in the motley slave population of Rome. This bronze statuette shows a negro house-boy cleaning one of his master's boots; it is the 'calceus' (see page 2012), worn only out of doors.

British Museum

husbands, and get divorced for the sake of marriage, and marry with an eye to divorce?' In fact, the tendencies observed under the Republic were carried on and accentuated, despite the efforts of Augustus; and his endeavour to increase the citizen population by legislation had little permanent effect. The growing passion for murderous exhibitions in the amphitheatre had their influence on the character of women and they were not averse from inflicting cruel punishments on their slaves. Sometimes, however, as in the letters of the younger Pliny, charming types of womanhood are met with, and those belonging to Stoic circles often showed great courage and devotion. Of such Fannia, the wife of Helvidius Priscus, who twice followed her husband into banishment, may be particularly noted.

One great cause of the vices of the women of Imperial Rome was undoubtedly their lack of serious occupation. The breaking down of home life was not compensated for by any new outside interests of value. Little is known as to the more advanced education of Roman girls, though in the elementary stage they





#### ROMAN CHILDREN'S TOYS

The toy (right) with groups of 'pips' on three facets was a kind of tectotum; the ivory disk, one of the pieces used in a game resembling backgammon. The wooden horse was drawn about by a string through its nostrils.

*British Museum*

were taught with boys, as can be gathered from Martial's statement that the elementary schoolmaster earned the hatred of boys and girls alike. As compared with men, the average woman was probably deficient in culture, though Propertius implies that the title 'accomplished' was one to be prized by a woman. The younger Pliny's wife Calpurnia was a rare exception, for she displayed a lively interest in her husband's literary activities, and even set his verses to music.

But the advocates of higher education for women might certainly find support of a negative character from the condition

of upper class women in Imperial Rome, which never produced a lady of real learning like the Byzantine princess Anna Comnena. Such accomplishments as the women had were of the dilettante order, a little writing, a little singing and a little lyre-playing, after the fashion recommended by Ovid in his *Lover's Art*. The majority devoted all their time to dress and the toilet, frivolities, amorous intrigues, and to displaying themselves at entertainments of a by no means uplifting character. Pliny the elder says that nearly a million pounds of money at least was lost each year to the Empire to pay for women's luxuries imported from the East.

Athletics and an open-air life made little appeal to the Roman woman, and herein the woman of to-day has a decided advantage. Dancing was mainly for the professional of doubtful reputation. It is true that some women, partly under compulsion and partly from a debased love of notoriety, entered into unnatural forms of sport. Juvenal tells us that there were women who, Atalanta-like, engaged in bear hunts, and under Nero and Domitian women of senatorial and equestrian rank fought in the arena, but these were rightly regarded as monstrosities. Some women aped men in their dress, and were fond of associating with men of the sporting type. But, in general, idleness and luxury may be put down as the prime causes of much of the immorality which characterised a large section of the women of the early Empire.



#### ONE WHOM THE GODS LOVED: THE STORY OF A SHORT LIFE

A touching story is unfolded on this sarcophagus on which the bereaved parents have depicted the various stages of their little son's short life. First he is shown, a baby, at his mother's breast, his father looking on; next, a little older, in his father's arms; then a happy little lad driving his own goat-chaise; and last scene of all, old enough now to begin home lessons, standing before his father and repeating some piece of poetry or prose.

*The Louvre: photo, Giraudon*

It is time, however, to turn our attention to the more intimate features of these inhabitants of Imperial Rome, and to see how they were housed, how they were dressed, what were their principal occupations, what their amusements, and what were their distinctive manners in everyday life.

Augustus (63 B.C.-A.D. 14) is said to have found a city of brick and to have left a city of marble. This exaggerated statement contains a germ of truth, in that he greatly increased the magnificence of the city by his buildings in the Campus Martius, his restoration of temples and his opening of a new forum. The main features which would strike the eye of a visitor to Rome towards the end of the first century after Christ would

be the various open spaces or *fora*, surrounded by porticoed public buildings and enclosing temples with their lavish display of statuary, the magnificent palaces, library and houses on the Palatine, the great space of the Campus Martius with its temples, baths, theatres and athletic courses; the huge Colosseum, the triumphal arches and the great *Thermae*, or bathing establishments, in different quarters of the city. Even to-day the visitor with imagination who stands on the Palatine Hill can faintly reconstruct some of the splendours of Imperial Rome; but he cannot fully conceive what it was like in the days when it contained the masterpieces of sculpture from a despoiled Greece, when every temple was a museum, and the city boasted a variety of marble columns such as the world has never seen since.

But Imperial Rome concealed much that was mean and sordid behind all this magnificence, and Juvenal lets us know that streets were narrow and ill-paved, and that sleep was disturbed because of the clatter of wheeled traffic which could only proceed by night. 'The passage of wagons in the narrow, winding streets and the abusive language of the drover



#### MY LADY'S MAIN PREOCCUPATION

Serious occupation was sadly lacking in the lives of most gentlewomen in Imperial Rome. They devoted much time to their toilet, like this great lady commemorated on her tomb with no fewer than four maids assisting at the arrangement of her coiffure, which she watches in a mirror held before her.

*Trévis Museum; photo, Archives photographiques d'art et d'histoire*

brought to a standstill would snatch sleep even from a somnolent emperor, like Claudius, and a company of seals.' By day the rich man's palanquin, borne by gigantic slaves, would drive everything before it, and sweep aside unoffending citizens like a tidal wave. The air would be full of a babel of discordant cries, for Rome teemed with foreigners, and to these were added the shouts of vendors selling their wares. The shops were more open to the public view than are those of western Europe to-day, and would add greatly to the liveliness, the barber's and apothecary's in particular serving as small clubs.

There were two main types of houses, the private, in which the wealthier families lived, and the tenement buildings, which were the homes of persons of moderate or small means. We have a clear idea of the former from excavations, particularly at Pompeii and Herculaneum; a less clear knowledge of the latter, but one which has been improved by recent excavations at Ostia, the port of Rome.

The wealthier Roman's house was self-contained, but might have shops, not connected with it, built on either side of the entrance. The windows in the outer



Excavations at Pompeii have disclosed numerous villas of the Roman plutocracy. This was the garden dining-room of Cornelius Tapes. Four pillars supported a vine trellis under which the triclinium was set. At the back is a shrine that held a statuette and in front is a truncated column on which another bronze figure stood. Marble tables were dotted about the lawn outside.

*Photo, Naples National Museum, courtesy of Prof. F. Halbherr*



An equally delightful pleasure was attached to the Argus Villa at Herculaneum, a colonnaded peristyle in which such men as Cicero and Seneca and Calpurnius Piso may well have walked and talked. For while Pompeii was a large provincial town with an active trade and a population of rich business people, Herculaneum was a quiet retreat where the aristocracy built splendid private villas frequented by the foremost figures in the artistic and intellectual world of the time

#### CHARMING PRIVATE VILLAS OF THE WORLD OF WEALTH AND FASHION

*International Press Bureau*

walls were few, and light was derived chiefly either from an opening in the roof or from a courtyard. Our Roman householder passed from the street-door through a vestibule into a large room—the atrium, which had an opening in the roof with a corresponding basin in the floor for disposing of the rain water. To the left and right were small rooms, used in imperial times chiefly as sitting or store rooms; facing him was a large open room containing his safe and family archives, with wings on either side where his wax family portraits might be displayed. This was the old part of the house used for reception rather than living purposes. To the right of the archive room was a passage, giving a glimpse of the sun-lit court beyond, the columned peristyle, round which were ranged the living and sleeping rooms, sometimes in two storeys, and also the domestic offices. The court was gay with flowers and statues, and usually had a fountain in the centre.

An important room off the peristyle was the dining-room, with its three fixed couches for the reclining guests ranged round a table; and large houses would have a library with rolls of parchment and papyrus. There were sometimes, also, private bathrooms, but Rome was so




#### ROMAN KITCHEN UTENSILS

Roman kitchen utensils were much like their modern equivalents. Here are a stove for keeping food hot (left), and (right) strainers with one and two handles, a wine dipper like a pitcher-plant with folding handle, and a ladle.

*British Museum*

rich in public bathing establishments that these were comparatively rare. The kitchen, and in its neighbourhood the water-closet, were placed in the peristyle; the hearth was a simple rectangular stone structure in which charcoal was burned in cavities. A noteworthy feature of the kitchen was its shrine for the household gods, the practical Roman considering that the Lares and Penates and the house genius in serpent form found their fitting home there. The floors were of tiles or mosaic, and the walls decorated with frescoes, which sometimes reached the standard of pictures of considerable merit. In general, the Roman private house was well adapted for a warm and sunny climate. The front part was shady, the back airy.

Very different was the housing of the poorer classes. Huge blocks of tenement buildings called 'islands' were a feature of Rome, and in many cases these were of a most unsatisfactory description. Those revealed by the excavations at



#### AN INTERRUPTED MEAL

Dining-rooms in Roman houses usually opened on to the peristyle, conveniently close to the kitchen. In one house at Pompeii the table in the middle of the three fixed couches for the reclining diners was found laid ready for a meal, and with a bronze balance used as kitchen scales

*Photo Professor Halbherr*



At Ostia the tenement houses seem to have differed from those at Rome in not being built round the four sides of a courtyard but along the line of the street, with courtyards or gardens at the rear overlooked by balconies, as in this restoration of the House of Frescoes. In other respects they were built on the same principle, containing separate flats on three or four floors.



Huge blocks of houses, called *insulae*, accommodated those not wealthy enough to own a private house. Naples offers modern analogies to these buildings, and their style can be studied at Ostia. Here is a reconstruction of the house of Diana at Ostia—a four-square structure of unfaced brick, with shops and offices on the ground floor entered by large doors, and, above these, self-contained flats with separate entrances. The windows on the second floor opened on to a brick balcony.

#### TENEMENT BUILDINGS THAT HOUSED THE ROMAN MIDDLE CLASSES


*Reconstructions by Gismondi; courtesy of Dr. Ashby*

Ostia are of a better class. In these tenements whole families were housed in a few rooms or a single room, and a common shrine served their religious needs. Modern Naples offers analogies to these dwellings, whose height was by legislation restricted to sixty or seventy feet. They far outnumbered the private houses, and may therefore be regarded as the dwelling-places of the mass of the citizens. It is therefore important to bear in mind that they varied greatly in quality, and that a satirist naturally described the worst specimens of the type. A slave janitor had charge of the 'islands' and collected the rent. It is to the worst class of these buildings that Juvenal's vivid description of garrets of high price and uncertain stability applies, and it was from them that an unexpected shower of crocks and slops might descend upon the head of the hapless passer-by.

They would also afford much employment to the freedmen cohorts of watchmen organized by Augustus, with their seven stations distributed in the fourteen regions of the city. The trumpet which summoned them and their siphon-hoses and axes must often have sounded from these 'islands'; so often indeed that the emperors of the second century made regulations which would astonish the modern householder indignant at being fined for letting his chimney catch fire. We learn that 'inhabitants of islands and others, who through lack of care allow fires to break out, may be sentenced to flogging with canes or scourges.' The office of the Chief Commissioner of Police, the City Prefect, can have been no sinecure at Rome, for he was responsible for the control of the fire-brigade as well for the policing

of the streets, which were badly lit and haunted by footpads.

The outdoor garb of the citizens who dwelt in these houses would strike us as strange. The voluminous white woollen 'toga' was the distinctive garb of the Roman. Its ordinary shape was a segment of a circle, and it seems probable that its length was about eighteen, and its depth seven feet. The draping of such a garment was naturally something of a work of art, and its cumbrous nature made the wearer only too glad to lay it aside. But Augustus, as an upholder of ancient customs, insisted on its being worn in the Forum



ILLUMINANTS FOR ROMAN HOUSES

Oil lamps were often hung by chains from the branching arms of a tall lamp-stand set on a massive base (left), but tripod stands assumed many forms. Out of doors lanterns were used, cylindrical in shape with the lamp enclosed within translucent horn, bladder, linen or talc, and covered, like a modern storm lantern, with an adjustable lid.

British Museum

and Circus. On the other hand, the Roman was unencumbered with hat or stockings, and wore a leather boot reaching some way up the calf. His women-folk had a simpler outdoor cloak called the 'palla,' which by its bright colour would afford a contrast to the whiteness of the toga, and allowed scope for individual taste in the draping. Indoors both sexes wore a long tunic and leather sandals.



Men in the first century of the Empire were clean shaven, though the wearing of moustache and beard came into fashion in the next. Women bestowed much attention on their hair-dressing, and under the Flavian Emperors high fringes, supported on metal circlets, were in vogue. The wealthier Roman lady was very fond of jewelry, and much of it, characterised by a lavish use of precious stones, has come down to us.

How did the Romans thus housed and thus attired pass their time? A large question, and one which clearly can only be answered in broad outline. A distinction can be made between serious occupation and mere amusement. The Roman was ordinarily an early riser; and, even before his light breakfast of bread, fruits and honey at about nine o'clock, the man of wealth and position went through a very tedious ceremony in the reception hall in the front portion of his house. His clients arrived to pay



#### OUT-OF-DOORS ROMAN COSTUME IN IMPERIAL TIMES

The toga was the distinctive article of Roman costume, once worn by every Roman when he went out in the city, but at this period tending to give place, except on formal occasions, to the more comfortable Hellenistic attire—especially among women (left). How men draped a toga is shown on the right. Certain differences of rank were marked by different 'calcei.' Those worn by the ordinary citizen (top) were closed shoes with sole and upper leather, fastened by straps above the ankle. Women also might wear the toga, but more usually the palla or cloak (centre), often brightly coloured.

*British (above), Lateran (left, photo, A. H. M.), Dresden (centre) and Berlin Museums.*

their morning call; and Juvenal has left us a lively account of what commonly took place at the interview. A motley crowd arrived and after a perfunctory greeting scrambled for meagre doles placed in baskets on the threshold. The formality had come to be a nuisance to patron and client alike.

After his light breakfast the more seriously minded Roman of high standing gave himself over to legal work for the next few hours. Pleading at the bar was particularly common between nine and ten, though most of the cases would have seemed trivial to a Hortensius or a Cicero. But oratory was the fashion, and was encouraged by the Roman system of education, although good judges like Tacitus were well aware of its super-



#### ELABORATE JEWELRY

Precious stones were lavishly used in the rather massive jewelry of which the Roman women were very fond. This necklace is of black and white gilded glass beads, garnets, amethysts, and lapis lazuli.

*Victoria and Albert Museum*

ficiality. The younger Pliny made his name in the Court of the Hundred, which dealt with cases of inheritance, wills and property. This court held its sittings in the Basilica Julia, divided from the old Forum by the Sacred Way, one of those large columned halls which furnished a model for early Christian churches.

The Forum would present a scene of great animation at about ten o'clock, for most of the male population spent their time in the open air, and the fora, like the modern piazzas, were places where all men met. Here the porticoes were full of loungers and gossipers, the bankers and money-changers plied their trade—just as in Eastern countries they carry on their business in the open air to the present time—and on market



#### EARLY AND LATER EMPIRE FASHIONS OF DRESSING THE HAIR

In the early days of the Empire Roman women seem to have dressed their hair in comparatively simple styles, two of which are depicted in the coloured wall paintings (left) from Pompeii. Under the Flavians, however, enormous fringes came into fashion, becoming more exaggerated until in the time of Trajan they assumed the proportions shown on the centre head. The side view of the same head shows how the back hair was twisted into an elaborate series of plaits.

*Naples Museum and Capitoline Museum, Rom.*





#### SITTING FOR AN INFORMAL MEAL

The Romans took breakfast about nine o'clock, the fare usually consisting of bread, dried fruits, honey and cheese. The mid-day meal, 'prandium,' was commonly a cold collation. The principal meal of the day, 'cena,' was served in the large dining-room about 4 o'clock and was an elaborate repast.

Musée St. Germain; photo, Archives photographiques

days the stalls of the countryfolk were conspicuous. The din was occasionally heightened by the arrival of a funeral train with its noisy retinue of flute-players and horn-blowers. Few spots in the world could have offered a greater variety of sights than did the Roman Forum on a market day, surrounded as it was by splendid temples and public buildings, and overshadowed by the magnificent Capitol and the Palatine Hill.

The Centumviral Court in Pliny's day had, he complained, fallen from its high estate. Cases were for the most part trivial, and the pleaders often ill-mannered and supported by a hired clique. Yet famous cases were from time to time heard in the Senatorial Court, and these gave the pleader full scope for his rhetorical powers. If there were no pleadings on hand, there were plenty of semi-legal functions for the Roman gentleman. He might be called upon to act as witness to wills and betrothals, or as assessor to magistrates, and for the senator there was the business

of the Senate, though that body was by this time much under the influence of the emperor.

Another occupation which must not be passed over was the duty of a man of literary leanings either to declaim his own works or to listen to the declamations of his friends. The practice, which has met with much ridicule, had, especially in the absence of the printing press, a function of considerable importance with respect to literature, but was apt to become a burdensome duty, and as such is freely satirised by Juvenal. Pliny, always prone to take things seriously, complains of unappreciative audiences, and

some, indeed, went so far as to send their slaves as proxies.


A more frivolous section of the population devoted even the morning to



#### A MERRY BANQUET AT POMPEII

This fresco represents a party in a Pompeian tavern. The slave-boy is offering a cup of wine to a late arrival whose shoes are being removed; another guest, already inebriated, is being helped out of the room, and a negro slave is waiting on an older man on one of the couches.

National Museum, Naples; photo, Anderson



## CENTRE OF ROMAN CIVIC LIFE UNDER THE EMPIRE

Under the Republic the Forum Romanum served both as place of popular assembly and as market place, and up to the time of Julius Caesar there were shops on both sides of it. It was also used sometimes for spectacular displays. Under the Empire these were relegated to the amphitheatre, circus and theatre, markets were provided elsewhere, the shops were cleared away, and the Forum became the centre for the law courts, exchange and similar civic transactions.

gambling, which had a great vogue in Imperial Rome, or went to see pantomimes or charioteers practising for the circus. Tacitus tells us that the rage for pantomimists, gladiators and horses was the peculiar vice of Rome, almost conceived in the mother's womb.

The labours of the morning ended at noon, and then the midday meal was taken, consisting usually of a cold collation, followed by the siesta customary in hot climates. The afternoon was generally devoted to exercise and recreation. Young men and boys would flock to the Campus Martius, and from about one-third to three-third indulge in running, wrestling, jumping, boxing or swimming in the Tiber, with the informality characteristic of Roman athletics. Organized games after the Greek fashion had occasionally been introduced under the Republic, but they never attained real popularity with the Romans. The older men were contented with milder exercise in the shape of ball-throwing, but nothing in the nature of golf or tennis is mentioned. Horace sometimes took part in

the popular ball-game called 'the triangle,' and he tells us:

When fiercer sun and weariness remind  
Of bathing, field and ball I leave behind.

Bathing, indeed, was an important item in the day of an Imperial Roman, and his needs in this respect were well catered for. The emperors vied with one another in erecting magnificent public baths, *Thermae*, or 'Warm Baths,' as they were called; and by the third century there were eleven of these huge establishments in Rome, together capable of accommodating at least fifteen thousand citizens. This estimate takes no account of the numerous private baths, of which there were over nine hundred. The great *Thermae* were capable of serving all possible needs of men and women with regard to bathing, and supplied at the same time the conveniences of luxurious clubs. The hours during which they were open varied; at some periods they could be visited only from about two p.m. to sunset, at others from sunrise till late at night. The average Roman, however, was content to take his baths following the afternoon exer-

cise; generally he entered the hot-air room first, and after perspiring freely there, took a hot bath and finally a cold one, or else a plunge in the swimming pool.

Unguents were freely rubbed into the skin to prevent cold, hence the quantities of Roman oil-flasks and scrapers, or strigils, which have come down to us. As a rule separate bath-sets were provided for men and women, but sometimes different times of the day were set apart

for the two sexes, and attempts were even made from time to time to introduce mixed bathing; these, however, drew forth prohibitory imperial edicts. The mad Elagabalus gave formal permission for mixed bathing. It may be added that prices of admission were moderate, and in some baths at least the smallest copper coin could secure entrance.

After the bath came dinner, which took place in one of the dining-rooms, fitted



WESTWARD VIEW FROM THE TEMPLE OF VESTA TO THE FORUM ROMANUM

A succession of splendid buildings enclosed the Roman Forum in its great days. Here (left) are the Atrium and circular Temple of Vesta and towering above them the Temple of Castor and Pollux. Beyond that, on the south side of the Sacred Way, stretches the façade of the Basilica Julia, and at the west end the view is bounded by the Tabularium, or Record Office, rising above the temples of Saturn, Vespasian and Concord, in front of which the Rostra can here be just distinguished.

*Restoration by J. Hoffbauer*

with three couches (triclinia), as has been mentioned above. The meal started at about four p.m., and was lengthy, so much so that three hours were considered a moderate time to spend on the meal. Women, when present, sat, or this at least was the ordinary custom. Ovid mentions the banquet as one of the opportune moments for love making. Lettuces, shell-fish and eggs served as hors d'oeuvre, and were followed by the courses proper, which


derived their Latin name from the trays on which they were served. These courses tended to become more and more numerous, and Elagabalus gave a dinner of twenty-two; wealthy men, moreover, vied with one another in supplying rare varieties of fish, fowl and flesh. The freedman Trimalchio devised dainties underlying the apparent courses as surprises for his guests, and the slave carver became a person of importance, expected to wield



#### BROKEN COLUMNS AND CRUMBLING RUINS OF THE ROMAN FORUM

Almost precisely the same area shown in the opposite page is covered in this photograph. But to-day the Temple of Castor and Pollux is represented by three pillars only. Eight Ionic columns still stand of all that graced the Temple of Saturn, three Corinthian columns (only two distinguished here) show where Vespasian's temple was, and nine pillars represent the Porticus Deorum Consentium. Only the Arch of Septimius Severus remains virtually intact, and the much later Column of Phocas (A.D. 608).

*Photo, Anderson*



In the reconstruction in page 2016 the Forum is viewed from the Atrium of Vesta. Here it is seen from the opposite angle, with a corner of the Basilica Julia on the right, the temple of Castor and Pollux between it and the Temple of Vesta, and on the left of that the Temple of Julius Caesar with the Rostra Julia (see also page 1788) in front. Beyond rise the palaces of the Caesars on the Palatine.

*From a reconstruction by R. Lauciani*




On the left of this stretch of the Sacra Via (Sacred Way) are the enclosing colonnade of the Temple of Venus and Rome and the Arch of Titus, through which the Way, coming from the Forum, turns and passes on towards the Colosseum. From this point the Clivus Palatinus branches off and leads away from the spectator up the Palatine Hill to the imperial palaces seen in the background; it was lined by shops on the right, and the street fountain suggests the excellent water supply of Rome.


**LIFE AMID THE MARBLE SPLENDOURS OF THE HEART OF ROME**

his knife with the skill and grace of an artist. An offering to the household gods took the place of grace after meat, and dessert then followed in the shape of dried and fresh fruits and cakes. Drinking was principally indulged in after the banquet, when the elected 'master of drinking' determined the proportions of wine and water. Italy itself supplied excellent wines, the best of which were from Campania, but Greek wines were freely imported.

Certain features of these dinners would strike us as strange—the reclining guests with their bare feet, the absence of knives and forks, the gesticulations of the carver, and the washing of the hands between each course. But the leisureed ease of the meal afforded opportunity for good conversation and the vulgarities of a Trimalchio




Ostia demonstrates the architectural variety of a Roman town and the free use of loggias in the street façades. The ground floor of the five-floored building above was occupied by shops, with the proprietors' names above them and with trade signs, such as the amphorae beside the wine-shop at the corner.



The principal street in Ostia, the Decumanus, ran from west to east, its continuation outside the gate becoming the main road to Rome. The finest shops were in this street, and on its north side stood the theatre and beyond it the baths, here shown reconstructed, together with a fountain between the two. At the far end was the Roman Gate, and beyond the gate the street was lined on both sides with columbaria containing hundreds of cinerary urns.

#### ATTRACTIVE ARCHITECTURE IN ROME'S GREAT SEAPORT


*From reconstructions by Gismondi; courtesy of Dr. Ashby*



ROMAN CIVILIZATION'S SUPREME ACHIEVEMENT: THE IMPERIAL BATHS OF DIOCLETIAN

Diocletian's Baths were even larger than the Baths of Caracalla, which, however, they resembled in general plan though with differences in detail. The frigidarium, for instance, seen on the left of this perspective view certainly was open to the sky. Modern civilization has no buildings to show comparable to these imperial thermae, with their provision for all the amenities of intellectual life as well as for every kind of athletic pursuit. In order to give a clear idea of the interior the Baths are here shown in transverse section, with the walls and the roof of the crowded, marble-paved tepidarium removed.

*From Paulin, 'Les Thermes de Diocletien'*



#### **A DREAM OF ARCHITECTURAL BEAUTY: THE BATHS OF CARACALLA**

All that remains of the Baths of Caracalla is shown in the air view in page 2021. This reconstruction gives some idea of their original splendour. The Tepidarium, with small rooms for warm baths opening off from it, was the most richly ornamented hall. Beyond it was the Frigidarium, with swimming pool and cold baths; on the other side was the Caldarium, with hot baths.

*To face page 2020*





#### GLIMPSES OF ROMAN LIFE AND ART IN FRAGMENTS OF COLOURED STONE

The bustle of city gaiety and the quiet of an imperial pleasaunce here both receive treatment in the most characteristic of Roman arts—mosaic work. At the top are actors dressing for a play in the green-room of a theatre at Pompeii; note the masks that were a convention of the Graeco-Roman drama. Below are doves drinking at a basin, from Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli.

*National Museum, Naples, and Capitoline Museum, Rome; photos, Andersen*

are not to be taken as typical. Music was not infrequently provided at intervals. Late hours were not a feature of the Roman banquet, for it started early, and the absence of street lighting and the habit of early rising would induce the guests to 'ask for their shoes,' the signal for departure, at a reasonable hour.

Such was an average day's life in Imperial Rome, but the citizen had frequent opportunities of enjoying far more exciting distractions. The dweller in the capital found it hard to abstain from visiting the spectacles of the circus, the theatre and the amphitheatre. We have seen that these were in full swing in Republican Rome, but under the Empire the number of days on which 'games' were celebrated rose to 175. These excitements were now a part of the emperor's policy to keep a vast and idle population amused rather

than religious ceremonies or, as they had become in the later years of the Republic, gigantic advertisements for ambitious politicians. They were open free to all citizens, and senators and knights had special places allotted to them.

At the foot of the Palatine Hill lay the Circus Maximus, used primarily for chariot racing, and calculated to hold at least 150,000 spectators. The Flaminian Circus in the Campus Martius held a scarcely smaller number. In a few lines Juvenal indicates the tense atmosphere of the circus while a race was in progress:

The Circus holds the whole of Rome to-day.  
Shouts thrill the sky: 'Are the Greens winning say?'

If they are beaten the whole City groans,  
No less than when for Cannae bitter moans  
Arose. Young men beside young maidens  
fair


Are sitting—backers' hoarse cries fill the air



#### SUPERB MONUMENTS OF IMPERIAL ROMAN CIVILIZATION

The remains of the Baths of Caracalla—here seen from the air—are more complete than those of any other of the imperial thermae. The main block covers an area of 270,000 square feet—greater than that of the Houses of Parliament in London—and the Central Hall measures 183 feet by 79 feet. On the right and left of the main block are the porticoed open 'palaestrae' with separate baths for athletes. The internal splendour of the Baths is shown in the colour plate facing page 2020.

*Photo, Italian Aeronautical Service*




### GLADIATORIAL COMBATS IN THE AMPHITHEATRE

Numerous illustrations of gladiatorial contests are extant. On the top strip of this stucco relief from a tomb are shown duels between mounted gladiators, Samnites with oblong shields, Thracians with round targets, and retiarii with tridents. The middle strip shows (left) the Samnite helmet with its cheek pieces and (right) the fish-crested light helmet of the mirmillo. The bottom strip depicts a 'venatio,' in which the gladiators were pitted against wild beasts.

From 'Musée Borbonico'

The two 'racing colours' of the Republic (see Chap. 63) had given place to four, the white, the green, the red and the blue, and these were increased by Domitian to six by the addition of a gold and a purple faction. Emperors like Caligula and Vitellius were strong partisans of the

Greens; and in Rome were anticipated the frenzied scenes of the Hippodrome at Constantinople. In both cities the Circus became a place where popular clamour could find free vent. The servile drivers of the chariots amassed vast sums of money, were made heroes to whom statues were



### IMPERIAL ROME'S FAVOURITE SPORT: CHARIOT RACING IN THE CIRCUS

This mosaic from Barcelona gives a detailed picture of a Roman circus. Down the middle of the course was a rectangular 'spina' or barrier with various altars and statues on it, including one of Cybele mounted on a lion—the Ludi Megalenses having been founded in her honour—and a table with the seven ovoid balls used to indicate the number of laps covered by the competitors. At each end of the spina was the 'meta' or turning post, three cones mounted on a tall, semicircular base.

From Hubner, 'Annali'

erected; and the names of the winning horses were in the mouths of all. Martial, who wrote many epigrams on these and other spectacles, alludes thus to the famous charioteer Scorpus, winner, it is said, of over two thousand victories:


One or two may deign to glance  
At the child my wit begets,  
When they've argued Scorpus' chance,  
And have duly booked their bets.

The Circus was a narrow oblong of some two thousand feet, with one end rounded, and along its axis ran a low wall called the 'spine', surmounted by small shrines, statues, and bronze models of seven eggs and seven dolphins; the turning of these last kept the spectators acquainted with the number of rounds which had been completed by the chariots. At the ends of the 'spine' were three pillars, and this was the danger spot for charioteers as they rounded them. The chariots started from stalls with folding doors, placed at the straight end of the oblong and known as 'prisons'; the signal for the start was given by a consul, who threw down a white cloth.

The maximum number of horses to a chariot had, under the Republic, been four, but this number was often exceeded in Imperial times, as was the number of

chariots, normally four, which ran in a heat. Reliefs bring vividly before us the dangerous character of these contests. The charioteer had the ends of the reins wound round him, and in the not infrequent event of a spill had to try to cut himself free with the knife he invariably carried. The maintenance of these circus games, with the vast staff of drivers and trainers required, was not the least heavy item of expenditure which fell upon the emperor's privy purse.

For those who found the spills in the Circus too mild an excitement, the Amphitheatre provided more blood-curdling entertainments. The Colosseum, built by the emperor Vespasian and his son Titus, and capable of seating at least fifty thousand spectators, is regarded as the Roman amphitheatre par excellence. Yet the remains of numerous amphitheatres in the provinces are proof that others did not fall far behind it in impressiveness. The principal shows in the amphitheatre were those of gladiators, wild beast fights and naval combats. Gladiators had been known in the Roman world as far back as the third century before Christ, and the revolt of gladiators under Spartacus had startled Italy early in the first century. The gladiators were



A FOUR-HORSE RACING CHARIOT AND A CHARIOTEER

Racing chariots were built as light as possible of wood and bronze, and were usually drawn by two or four horses, but expert drivers could manage teams of six, seven and even ten horses. The charioteer (right) wore a short tunic, close fitting cap and a number of leather thongs laced about the body and thighs as protection in case of accident. He also carried a knife wherewith to cut the reins, which were looped round the waist, in emergency.

*British Museum and The Vatican; (photo (right), Mancini)*

principally prisoners of war and criminals, but, in some cases, were men of the upper classes, whose spendthrift habits, like those of Juvenal's Rutilus, had brought them to the training school.

After a careful training in this school, the gladiators exhibited their prowess in the arena. A preliminary bout took place with sham weapons, and then the combatants, as drawn by lot, faced each other in the real struggle. Sometimes one of the pair was killed outright, but more often the beaten gladiator raised his left hand in appeal for mercy. Then the spectators massed in their tiers had the decision and, according as their thumbs were turned down or towards their breast, signifying that the victor's weapon should be dropped or plunged into the victim's breast, determined the release or dispatch of the loser. To secure as great a variety as possible in the spectacle, the gladiators were made to assume various types of arms, such as the Samnite with crested helmet and oblong shield, the Thracian with curved dagger and small shield, or the retiarius (net thrower) with net, dagger and trident. Sometimes there were combats of mounted gladiators. All these types are represented

on Roman lamps or other monuments. The degrading spectacle of women gladiators, alluded to by Statius in the lines

The weaker sex unskilled the sword to wield  
In manlike combats boldly takes the field,

is illustrated by a relief in the British Museum.


Another highly popular spectacle was that of the wild beast fights. Cicero's verdict on these exhibitions, called 'hunts,' has been recorded in the chapter on Republican social life (Chap. 63), but his disapprobation was not shared by the mass of the Romans. A wonderful variety of wild animals was imported for these fights; Martial mentions the tossing of a bull by a rhinoceros in Domitian's reign. It has been thought that the immense demand for wild beasts for this purpose had the effect of seriously diminishing the fauna of the Roman world. Beast was sometimes matched with beast, sometimes with a man, and at other times condemned criminals (Christians included) were mangled wholesale. More innocent exhibitions were those of trained and performing animals; but blood lust and cruelty predominated, and Domitian took a special pleasure in forcing men even of

noble family to fight in the arena, a fact to which Juvenal alludes in the lines:

It nought availed the  
wretch all stripped to  
stand

And pierce Numidian bears  
on Alban sand.

The amphitheatre could be flooded and turned into a lake on which naval battles were fought. In some cases a natural lake or a specially constructed basin was used for these spectacles. A famous combat of this kind was presented in A.D. 52 by the emperor Claudius on the Fucine lake, about fifty miles east of Rome, between fleets called Sicilian and Rhodian, in which no fewer than nineteen thousand men



TYPES OF ROMAN GLADIATORS

The retiarius (left) was armed with a net, in which he sought to enmesh his opponent, and a trident, 'fuscina.' For defence he wore a gauntlet on his left arm with a projecting shoulder-piece to mask the face. The Thraex (right) wore a heavy helmet, leather breeches and greaves on both legs, and carried a short dagger and small targe.

British Museum

were engaged, and the crews, consisting of criminals or prisoners of war, fought to the death. Every artifice was employed to make these combats as realistic as possible; sea water was sometimes introduced and marine creatures were placed in it. The surprising transformation of land to sea and sea to land in artificial basins is emphasised by Martial in an epigram on one of these shows given by Domitian:

Spectator from far distant skies,  
New-comer to this sacred sight,  
Let not the combat blind thine eyes—  
Land was this sea on which they fight.  
The naval conflict holds the field,  
But sea once more to land will yield.

The degrading influence of these blood-thirsty shows upon the character of the Romans can hardly be over-estimated.

The difference between ancient and modern of the amphitheatre sentiment in such matters can be judged by the disapprobation called forth in most quarters by the comparatively mild bull-fight. The institutions of wild-beast fights and chariot racing, but not gladiator shows, were carried to New Rome, Constantinople, when Constantine founded his Christian capital, but chariot racing alone maintained a vigorous existence there (see Chap. 85).

Imperial Rome had three large, permanent stone theatres, and a Concert Hall (Odeum) was built by Domitian. Though Nero instituted regular musical contests and occasional orchestral performances were given in the theatres, the populace as a whole never showed much taste for music. Nor did the drama produce marked creative talent or command a genuine enthusiasm in Rome.

The chief points which would strike a modern visitor if he could be transported to a Roman theatre would be its open-air character, and the high back wall of the stage elaborately decorated with marble veneers and furnished with niches for statues. The stage itself was long and broad, and had a semicircular space in front of it, the counterpart of our stalls, reserved for senators. Behind this rose the auditorium, the first fourteen rows of which

were reserved for the knights; the people were arranged by tribes, and separate places were assigned to boys, accompanied by their slave-tutors, and to women, who by a regulation of the emperor Augustus were installed in the upper rows. The emperor had a box on the right of the stage, the empress and the Vestal Virgins a corresponding box on the left. The auditorium was split up into numbered blocks or wedges, and the seats in these blocks were assigned by tickets, some of which are still extant. Awnings could be spread over the auditorium to keep out the sun and rain, and saffron was sprinkled to keep the house cool and fresh.

The social status of actors at Rome was low. They were slaves or freedmen, and the Roman citizen who ventured to act lost his civic rights. The manager was generally a freedman, and the actor-



WOMEN GLADIATORS IN THE RING

Pandering to the depraved craving for excitement, even women were engaged to fight as gladiators. This relief from Halicarnassus shows two such Amazons, armed like Samnites but without helmets, fighting on a platform.

British Museum

troupe was hired by the magistrate responsible for the games. Despite these drawbacks popular actors received high rewards. As Tertullian put it: 'What perversity! They love those they fine, they depreciate those of whom they approve, they extol the art and brand the artist.' So great was the rivalry between the supporters of different actors, that under the Empire the various clagues not infrequently came to blows. A tight hand was, however, kept upon the actors, and under the Republic magistrates had


the power of flogging them. Augustus removed this degrading penalty, and substituted banishment from Italy for offenders. But the chief scandals were connected with private theatricals, for rich persons not uncommonly maintained their own company of actors.

The curtain had not the same function as those in the theatres of to-day; it took the place of the modern back-cloth, and was lowered at the beginning of a play and raised at the end. The scenery was not very elaborate, usually consisting of a palace for tragedy and a street scene for comedy. Men played women's parts, and masks were used, while in tragedy the high buskin exaggerated the normal height of the actor. Thus the aim of all the productions was broad effect; no opportunity was given for facial display of emotion. The plays performed were imitations of the Greek. In tragedy Euripides was a

favourite, and such a play as the *Medea* of Seneca gives an idea of the turgid and declamatory style which found favour. Comedy continued on the lines of Plautus and Terence, whose plays again are based on Greek originals.

As under the Republic, mimes and pantomimes continued to be popular under the Empire. They touched the daily life of the people more closely, and, it may be added, gave greater opportunity for crude realism and licentiousness. The great fortunes mentioned in literature as having been amassed by actors usually apply to the pantomimists, and the most famous of these dumb-show actors in the first century of the Empire was the Egyptian Paris, whose epitaph Martial wrote in the following lines:


O traveller, treading the Flaminian way,  
Pass not this tomb without a look.  
Here lies a man whose wit and graceful play



RESTORATION OF THE MAGNIFICENT THEATRE AT OSTIA

As may be supposed, Ostia possessed a large and important theatre. It dates from the time of Augustus, but was twice restored, once in the time of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, and once at the end of the fourth century. This reconstruction shows what it was like in its prime: a rich proscenium with statues and columns and auditorium rising in two main divisions from a mosaic-paved orchestra. As usual, awnings spread from masts screened the audience when the sun was hot.

*After a reconstruction by Dr. E. Jouy-Joseph in 'Architektonische Einzelheiten'*



#### TYPE OF THE THEATRES THAT GRACED ROME : THE THEATRE AT ORANGE

The Roman theatre at Orange (the ancient Arausio) near Avignon, is the greatest building of its kind in France, its colossal façade, 120 feet high and 340 feet long, dominating the whole town. This photograph shows half of the massive wall of the scena and one of the side entrances for the actors. The seats of the auditorium were restored in 1894 and the theatre, which dates from the second century of our era, is still used occasionally for open-air performances.

*Photo, E.N.A.*

Nile gave, and Rome delighted took.  
With Paris buried lies the theatre's pride,  
Its loves, its griefs, and all that arts provide.

What manner of city was this Imperial Rome, a day in whose life has been described in outline? How would it compare with London of to-day? These questions apply to the two chief sides of life—its externals and its inner significance.

To the eye of a visitor Rome with its close-clustered fora and its public buildings ranged around them would be more compact and therefore more impressive than London, though the style of many of the buildings would bear a distinct resemblance to our own. The public statues would be far more numerous and artistically striking, and they were more effectively displayed. The most obvious difference would be the absence of the incessant movement of wheeled traffic. On the other hand, as far as human life is

concerned, the street scenes of Rome were much more varied and animated. There were the wealthy travelling in slave-borne litters and accompanied by a large retinue of attendants; the porticoes, a feature comparatively strange to us, were thronged with talkative loungers.

A much greater liveliness was displayed in shopping and bargaining, carried on for the most part in the open air. The toga and the palla were certainly more artistic than most of the varieties of modern costume. There was a continual babel of tongues, for Rome was a veritable meeting-place of the nations, and the slaves alone would afford a study for the ethnologist. Gesticulation, then as now, was more marked in a southern city, and quarrelling, it may be added, was more rife.

The emperor's comings and goings would attract more attention than the king's. The senators would be more



picturesque, but their doings would hardly attract more notice than those of the members of our own House of Lords, and certainly not as much as the proceedings of the House of Commons. The absence of newspapers was but poorly compensated for by the posted scraps of official news; but it must be remembered that the tongue would carry news with great rapidity through fora and porticoes. The declamations of rhetoricians and poets were frequent and noisy, but perhaps less well attended than many a public meeting to-day.

On the other hand the Campus Martius would present a more animated scene than any of our recreation spaces. Certainly a Test Match at Lord's or a Rugby International at Twickenham would pale into insignificance before the excitements of a gladiatorial or wild beast show in the Colosseum, and a Cossack exhibition would provide but mild thrills compared with chariot racing in the Circus Maximus. It is probable, however, that an Opera at Covent Garden, a play at His Majesty's, a variety entertainment at the Hippodrome or an orchestral concert at the Queen's Hall would equal in effect and surpass in artistic quality any entertainment that a theatre of Imperial Rome could provide, for art was not the Roman's strong point.

Our visitor, however, if of a reflective disposition, might try to go a little deeper, and ask whether human happiness has made great advances in the nineteen centuries which separate the great capitals of to-day from the Rome of the Emperors. He could certainly find cause for satisfaction in the great advances in transport facilities and mechanical conveniences of all kinds. He might discern on the whole in his own city a kindlier feeling between man and man, the outward monuments of which are to be seen in hospitals and numerous charitable

institutions. He would declare that there was a healthier tone amongst women, and a cleaner and more humane tendency in sport.

He might, however, be disposed to debate the question whether free domestic service was more satisfactory than servile, and whether modern industry, with its ever recurring labour troubles, promoted a more contented life.

The monotony of office and factory life might be contrasted disadvantageously with the rather easy-going open-air life of the average Imperial Roman, whose 'busy idleness' did not involve the strain of modern hustling. Many other developments of modern civilization would inevitably come up for judgement, and the question would arise whether the extension of education, the growth of the Press and even the invention of broadcasting have greatly promoted human happiness. There is no end to these and innumerable other similar problems. It is hoped that these pages have presented sufficient material in outline to enable the reader to ponder these things for himself, and though no final answer can be given in many cases, the exercise would not be without value.

Certain it is that Imperial Rome had as great a fascination for a Martial as London in his day had for a Samuel Johnson. Martial in his provincial retreat longed for 'the wit that supplied so many literary themes, the libraries, the theatres and the banquets, in which pleasure can learn without realizing it.' It is also certain that in the second century of the Empire under Antoninus Pius prosperity was widespread, and that the individual citizen enjoyed as much happiness under the protection of good laws as mortals can reasonably hope for. It was such prosperity, or at least the survival of it, radiating from the Mother City, that drew forth panegyrics like those quoted at the beginning of this study.

Has the sum of happiness increased?

## END OF THIRD VOLUME

